THE NATIONAL REVIEW

No. 359. JANUARY 1913

EPISODES OF THE MONTH

The Outlook

It would take a man even wiser than Lord Thurlow looked to penetrate the international situation as it presents itself on the eve of the season of peace and goodwill, and to say anything worth saying about it. Some persons amuse themselves and others by claiming omniscience and infallibility on every varying phrase of an amazing kaleidoscope, on each of which they are promptly proved to have been hopelessly astray. Our "special correspondents" in several places make themselves and their organs superlatively ridiculous by the quantity of "inside knowledge obtained from personages whose mere names would make Europe tremble," which they daily discharge upon a bewildered public, and which within forty eight hours at the outside is usually seen to have been gratuitous nonsense. Fortunately there are able and really well-informed men on the British Press who have not yet all been squeezed out and who at every crisis render admirable service to the great organs they represent, to their countries, and to Europe. The Foreign Department of the *Times* maintains its high traditions, and whatever changes may befall our leading journal it is sincerely to be hoped that those traditions may survive and that we may be spared the painful twaddle of "newspaper men" as anxious to live in the limelight as Cabinet Ministers, and who have lately taken to signing their names with disastrous results. The

unsigned telegrams to the *Times* from the leading capitals of Europe, sober, restrained, informed, responsible, offer a striking contrast to the effusions in other organs chiefly proceeding from Vienna, where the situation has been sufficiently strained without all this cheap competitive sensation-mongering. If one could transport oneself to Vienna and keep one's head, it might be possible to form some conception of the actual situation and even to hazard a prediction as to the future, about which competent persons are increasingly chary of prophesying. At any rate it would make one realise how futile it is to prophesy in London. Vienna seemingly holds the key of the position. Upon the success or defeat of the Vienna War Party, which is great if not growing, depends the peace of Europe—unless of course Vienna is dominated by Berlin and for the first time in this generation the relations between the two German capitals are obscure. You could certainly ascertain in Vienna far sooner than in Berlin whether Germany wants peace or war. Germany has a gift for getting her own way as the predominant partner in the Triple Alliance. If she wants war she will certainly have it, though should she want peace it is not now so absolutely certain that she can get it Two months ago Western Europe, sceptics as well as optimists, believed that Germany was not merely pacific in professions and no serious person would attach any seriousness to German professions—because they are part of the stock-in-trade of her diplomacy—but that she was sincerely and seriously working for peace. Paris and London were of this opinion. But there is less certainty to-day, owing to the many curious things that have happened in Vienna and to the prevailing ignorance as to the real relations between the Austro German allies.

Vienna

THAT the Vienna War Party has received no discouragement from Berlin is a mild statement of truth, though there have been occasional milk-and-water articles in the German semi-official Press gently remonstrating over some particularly extravagant proceeding. Then the Triple Alliance has been somewhat prematurely and ostentatiously renewed, and this renewal has been accompanied by the flamboyant declaration of the German Imperial Chancellor that an attack on Austria would be an attack on Germany, the tone of which was painfully

reminiscent of the "shining armour" episode of 1909.* The first question to be answered is, who will get the upper hand in Vienna? The Peace Party, which is by no means to be despised and has so far held its own, or the War Party, which contains several formidable elements, including a number of malicious and mendacious newspapers, and is convinced that for Austria-Hungary it is a case of now or never? Again, what subterranean encouragement from the War Party of Berlin has reached the War Party in Vienna? Would Austro-Hungarian Chauvinists attempt to keep their country so near the brink of danger unless they were absolutely convinced that they could count upon German support in the event of war, whether the Dual Monarchy was the attacking or the attacked party? All fair-minded men recognise that the Austro-Hungarian Government has in many ways displayed exemplary moderation. If Vienna was not unprepared for the Balkan War, it was as unprepared as the rest of the world for the sudden and striking victories of the Balkan League, which placed Austria-Hungary, as a partly German and partly Slav Empire, in an awkward not to say a dangerous dilemma. As a Slav Power she could not afford to antagonise the new Slav Power to the South, however much she might be concerned as to its magnetic attraction for her own Slavs. As a Teutonic Power she was appalled no less than Germany by the solid barrier arising between herself and cherished objects of ambition which may be crystallised in the phrase "Berlin to Bagdad." The Dual Monarchy showed great self-control when first the Sanjak of Novibazar and then Salonika were captured by the allies, but she firmly put down her foot upon Servia's claim to become an Adriatic Power. But even here the Dual Monarchy has shown moderation, because after many weeks of profound anxiety it is announced (December 21) to the general relief that the meeting of the six Ambassadors of the great Powers now sitting in London "have recommended to their Governments, and the latter have accepted, the principle of Albanian autonomy, together with a provision guaranteeing Servia commercial access to the Adriatic." It is also unofficially stated that the six Governments have agreed in principle on these two points, and speaking the next day (December 22) the French Prime Minister, Monsieur Poincaré, was able to declare that the future autonomous state of Albania is to be under the suzerainty

of the Sultan and the supervision of the Great Powers, and that Servian commercial access to the Adriatic would be secured by means of a neutral port on the Albanian coast and an international railway, under the control of Europe, with free transit for all goods, including munitions of war.

Disquieting Episodes

If this were all we might unfeignedly rejoice and re-echo the possibly premature ecstasies of the British Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, who predicted at a banquet to the Delegates of the Peace Conference, that he believed their negotiations would result in "an equitable, an honourable, and a durable peace." There is no single moment of any day in any year at which Mr. Asquith is not prepared to roll a similar sweet morsel under the tongue equally amid wars and rumours of wars just as in the piping times of peace. The Servian port has latterly been the centre of diplomatic controversy, and it might be arguable that if the Great Powers can agree upon this question, surely the belligerents who have supended hostilities (though Greece and Turkey are still fighting) in order to give themselves a chance of signing a definitive peace in the neutral atmosphere of London, should in their turn have little difficulty in settling their differences, as winners and losers have suffered so severely that all stand to gain more by making a reasonable peace than they can hope to secure from prolonging what would become an unreasonable war. Here, however, we come upon an obscure and dangerous phase of the crisis which not only affects the Balkan States, but likewise all the Great Powers. We have dwelt upon the pacific aspect of Austro-Hungarian policy, which reflects the highest credit upon the statesmanship of the venerable Emperor Francis Joseph and his Foreign Minister, but there have been much less attractive aspects indicating as they do that the war-at-any-price party, of which the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, the intimate friend of the German Emperor, is the head-centre, is hostile to the moderate official policy, and that so strong is the War Party that the Imperial Government continually finds itself constrained to make perilous concessions to the bellicose elements. We have no wish to say a word to inflame the acute situation in Vienna, but certain facts stare one in the face and cannot be avoided unless one is prepared to play the part of the professional

political ostrich. In the first place the military preparations of the Dual Monarchy have proceeded continuously, with the result that an immense army has been mobilised, thanks to the opportune assistance of the American money market. We have before now called attention to the growing entente between German and American finance as a factor to be reckoned with. Then again, no sooner had the Triple Alliance been renewed than certain significant changes were made in the Austro-Hungarian Government calculated to cause a painful impression in Italy, who was much perturbed by the unexpected reappearance as Chief of the Staff of General von Konrad, so keen a fire-eater that he is believed in Italy to have advised that Austria should take advantage of Italy's preoccupation in Tripoli to occupy certain portions of Albania, which would have been tantamount to a declaration of war on the Italian ally. What then must be his disposition towards Powers which are not allies, and how is his reappearance in the Councils of his Government to be interpreted elsewhere?

Ditto

THEN there has been a really outrageous campaign against Servia, with the deliberate object of inflaming Austrian public opinion, throughout the Austrian Press, founded upon what is now officially admitted to have been a mass of lies concerning the imaginary ill-treatment by Servia of the Austrian Consul Prochaska. What is grave in this affair is that the Press Bureau of the Vienna Foreign Office furnished the semi-official Press with incendiary accounts of an imaginary incident at the time when the truth was known to those in authority. These are all alarming facts because they are unimpeachable, but there are likewise indications, which are perhaps not in the category of ascertained facts though they receive wide credence and would account for a good deal which is otherwise inexplicable, that Austrian influences have been at work with a view to recover through diplomacy what has been lost in the Balkan War. How far Germany and Austria have been working hand in hand for this purpose we do not know, but there is reason to believe that at the most critical moment of the war Turkey was advised by powerful friends to continue her resistance to the utmost and to exploit any armistice which the enemy might be willing to agree to for the single purpose of strengthening her position so as to be able to

resume the conflict under more favourable circumstances, after her intractable attitude at the Conference had made Peace impossible. Up to the time of writing the Conference—about which Mr. Asquith and others cherish highly optimistic expectations as the prelude to another millennium—can only be described as a fiasco, as from day to day on one pretext or another the Turks have declined to transact any business. As all prophets during the last three months have made such pitiable exhibitions of themselves we are under no temptation to enter their ranks as it is impossible to foretell what may happen from day to day, and it may be that while these pages are in the press a complete transformation of the situation will be effected, and that the New Year will open under the happiest aspices. Or it may be that the Peace Conference in London will turn out to have been the greatest disaster which has ever befallen the Balkan States, who appeared to have victory within their grasp when the armistice was signed and that all efforts by Europe to localise the further conflict will fail, and that at last the great Armageddon will burst upon us. In any event we trust, though we are not hopeful, that the War Office and the Admiralty are not acting on the "beliefs" of Mr. Asquith, because if they are and those "beliefs" turn out to be unfounded it will be a very serious thing for the British Empire. But even supposing the "beliefs" should be well founded—and we hope they are quite as sincerely as the Prime Minister or any professional peacemonger—no harm will have been done if for once the War Departments take time by the forelock and make ready for war.

Canada's Intervention

THE word "epoch-making" is so hopelessly discredited by constant abuse that it would be insulting to apply it to the really great and pregnant speech in which Mr. Borden, the Canadian Prime Minister, informed the Dominion Parliament on December 5 of the decision of his Government to make an emergency contribution to the Imperial Navy of seven million pounds, or thirty-five million dollars. This sum represented the cost of the construction of three of the most powerful battleships of the latest type. They would be at the disposal of the Imperial Government for common Imperial defence, and are to be maintained and controlled by the British Admiralty.

Should Canada at any time decide to establish a Fleet unit she would have the call of these ships for that purpose. They would be built in the United Kingdom, and the Admiralty, in order to promote Canadian shipbuilding, would give orders for small cruisers and other essentials of a battle fleet. Mr. Borden's speech, of which considerable extracts are given elsewhere, was in every way worthy of the occasion and the policy, breathing as it did that lofty larger patriotism for which we are accustomed to look in Canadian statesmanship. "Time and again" we are told he was stopped by cheering which lasted many minutes, and when the Premier finished his peroration declaring: "We come thus to Great Britain's aid, in token of our determination to protect and ensure the safety and integrity of this Empire, and are resolved to defend on sea as well as on land our honour and our heritage," the speaker received a tremendous ovation and the whole house rose and sang the National Anthem. The scene was made all the more memorable by the presence of the Duchess of Connaught and Princess Patricia. Only one man remained seated, namely, Mr. Oliver, of Edmonton, ex-Minister of the Interior, who has thereby attained the particular fame he sought. Needless to say, Mr. Borden's declaration has made a profound impression in this country and has been rapturously applauded throughout the Empire. Even the British House of Commons, which is almost impossible to move on any patriotic occasion, the great majority of its members being completely absorbed in internecine wrangling, was anxious to take note of this unique event. But Mr. Asquith suggested in reply to Mr. Bonar Law, that "while his Majesty's Government fully recognised that it is both the desire and the duty of the House of Commons to give formal and authoritative expression to the universal feeling of warm appreciation and heartfelt gratitude which has been aroused in the Mother Country by the splendid patriotism and liberality displayed in this matter by their fellow subjects in the Oversea Dominions and Possessions," they were of opinion that it would be more appropriate "and only respectful to the Canadian Government and people to defer taking such action until the proposals made by Mr. Borden have been under consideration in the Canadian Parliament." Mr. Bonar Law fully concurred and felt convinced that "the expression of gratitude and appreciation

which he (Mr. Asquith) has made in this House will be highly appreciated in the Colonies."

Defence and Trade

IT would be a poor return on our part for Canada's munificence, which we recognise is in no sense a "subsidy" to the British Exchequer, but a contribution to the common Imperial cause, to enter the domain of Canadian domestic policy. The outstanding fact is that both Canadian parties are agreed upon the need of a serious naval policy undreamt of even two years ago. Of the enthusiasm here and of the enthusiasm in the Empire, Canadians must by this time be fully aware, but we should doubt, judging from the scanty sources of information on Foreign Affairs available in the Dominions, whether they have any conception of the profound and pacific impression which their action has made on Europe generally and upon Germany specially, who suddenly realises that the single effect of launching her ally, Austria-Hungary, who has neither a lengthy coast to defend nor Oversea Possessions nor a great maritime commerce, upon a naval career, has been to bring a brand new factor into the field with infinitely greater resources and capacities as a sea-Power, than the Dual Monarchy. We of the Mother Country must look to it that Mr. Asquith's pledge that the Canadian ships are not to be used as substitutes but as supplements to the British Navy is strictly carried out, and it is equally an obligation of honesty and honour that Mr. Borden's demand, that those now sharing the payment of the piper shall have some voice in calling the tune, be loyally and effectively met. Note that the Canadian Prime Minister associates defence and trade as inseparable, and this is the moment chosen by Unionist Little Englanders and Radical Little Englanders at home to revive their agitation against the policy of Preference upon which the commercial consolidation of the Empire depends!

Peccavi

NOT the least important part of Mr. Borden's speech, of which indeed it was an integral part, was the Admiralty Memorandum drawn up for the information of the Canadian Government. It is painfully interesting to the British people. It might have been appropriately entitled Peccavi, because it is nothing more nor less than a confession of ten years'

negligence by that Department of the State primarily charged with the sacred task of securing its safety. It is so gratifying to ascertain that the Admiralty is not more than ten years behind the times that we should be only too glad to let bygones be bygones had we the faintest confidence in the present régime or could we detect any indication that after making a clean breast of former failings there would be real improvement in the future. Unfortunately this is not the case, and the events of the past month confirm the view which we have always held as against the Churchill claque in the Unionist and Radical press that the present First Lord is not to be trusted a yard either to speak the truth or to do his duty by the Navy and the nation. It would be everything were the new Admiralty Board conscious of the shortcomings of their predecessors, since the opening of the century, to the point of being determined to turn over a new leaf and make a serious effort to cope with the perilous position to which this country has been brought by the blindness and deafness of successive First Lords and Admiralty Boards, who now stand officially convicted of having misled the public on matters of fact and of having completely misread a menace which was as plain as a pike-staff to unofficial students of international affairs. In many respects this Admiralty Memorandum bears a striking resemblance to the articles which able naval writers, principally Mr. H. W. Wilson, have contributed to the *National Review* year after year since Germany first issued her challenge, the only difference being that whereas Mr. Wilson was wise before the event and pointed out what must inevitably occur, if we played the fool as we did, the Admiralty and the Admiralty Press are wise after the event and can only lament that the inevitable has happened. The cynical exhortations addressed to the community by "great sailor politicians" like Sir John Fisher, and pinchbecks of the type of Mr. McKenna, "sleep quietly in your beds" are now seen in their true light.

Scepticism

THE leopard does not change its spots nor the Ethiopian his skin. We should never forget that among those mainly responsible for the parlous plight into which we have drifted as revealed by the Admiralty Memorandum prepared for Mr. Borden is the present First Lord, who devoted

the energies of his earlier ministerial career to fighting the Navy estimates. Indeed, so anxious were Mr. Churchill and his political twin, Mr. Lloyd George, to keep down the Navy in the critical year 1909 that both tendered their resignations—probably knowing that Mr. Asquith had not the courage to jump at the opportunity of emancipating himself from these brazen demagogues—if the Admiralty Estimates were accepted. Then, when the situation became alarming last year, and Germany made it manifest that she was merely awaiting the right moment to attack, Mr. Churchill feeling that his skin was involved took advantage of the hopeless inadequacy of the arrangements of the Admiralty, which was suddenly called upon to make bricks without straw, largely because the straw had been withheld by the Little Navyites of whom Mr. Churchill was the most conspicuous, to bully the Prime Minister into ejecting Mr. McKenna and his Board of Admiralty in order that the Windbag might secure a long-coveted post. Coming after so impossible an administrator as Mr. McKenna, Mr. Churchill as a clever man had a remarkable opportunity, but unfortunately there is some kink in his composition which prevents him from rendering loyal public service. He was a failure at the Colonial Office, a failure at the Board of Trade, a failure at the Home Office, and now he is a ghastly and dangerous failure at the Admiralty, because he thinks he knows everything whereas he knows nothing, and interferes with everybody to such a point as to have established chaos in Whitehall. The Admiralty is approximately in the same condition as was the British War Office on the eve of the Boer War. *Absit omen.* Under the circumstances it is desirable to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest this Peccavi, which should quicken the interest of people inside and outside Parliament in our appalling naval administration which is now in the hands of a political gambler of the worst type, whose talents lie in the direction of Press intrigue—hence the Churchill claque and the buckets of "eye-wash." Without great public pressure there is no chance whatsoever of reforming a Department described by those who know it as "living on the traditions of Trafalgar." While the Navy only asks to be let alone, to be properly paid, and to be provided with the wherewithal, in the shape of fleets, for doing its duty—the Admiralty requires

overhauling by men of intelligence as opposed to mere gasbags whose god is Limelight.

German Expansion

The Memorandum already referred to is described as originating with the invitation of the Prime Minister of Canada to his Majesty's Government to "prepare a statement of the present and immediately prospective requirements of the naval defence of the Empire for presentation to the Canadian Parliament if the Dominion Cabinet deem it necessary." The Admiralty "are prepared to comply and to supplement, in a form which can be made public, the confidential communications and conversations which have passed between the Admiralty and Ministers of the Dominion Parliament during their recent visit to the United Kingdom." While setting the greatest store by the important material and even more important moral assistance which Canada could contribute to the maintenance of British naval supremacy, the Admiralty desire "to disclaim any intention, however indirect, of putting pressure upon Canadian public opinion, or of seeking to influence the Dominion Parliament in a decision which clearly belongs solely to Canada." They consequently confine themselves exclusively to a statement of facts whence Canada might draw her own conclusions. The capacity of the British Empire to maintain the naval superiority essential to its security must obviously be measured by reference to other naval forces, and "from this point of view the development of the German Fleet during the last fifteen years is the most striking feature of the naval situation to-day. That development has been authorised by five successive legislative enactments, viz., the Fleet laws of 1898, 1900, 1906, 1908 and 1912," which cover the period up to 1920—unless, as we would remind the Admiralty, there are further naval developments in Germany, as there certainly will be unless this country adopts a really serious naval and military policy. It is something, indeed it is a great thing, that the Mandarins of Whitehall should have at last grasped the fact that Germany possesses a great navy as the result of efforts extending over half a generation, and though it is useless to cry over spilt milk no economist can help lamenting that the discovery was not made somewhat earlier. The times when we were officially told "to "sleep quietly in your beds" in order that the

Pooh-bah of the day might sleep more quietly in his, were the very times when we should have been most watchful and Pooh-bah most active. Whereas in 1898 the German Fleet consisted of 9 battleships (excluding coast-defence vessels), 3 large cruisers, 28 small cruisers, 113 torpedo-boats, 25,000 men, maintained at an annual cost of £6,000,000, the full German Fleet of 1920 would consist of 41 battleships, 20 large cruisers, 40 small cruisers, 144 torpedo-boats, 72 submarines, and 101,500 men, estimated to be maintained at an annual cost of £23,000,000.

From £6,000,000 to £23,000,000

But this great German jump from six millions to twenty-three millions "gives no real idea of the advance, for the size and cost of ships has risen continually during the period, and, apart from increasing their total numbers, Germany has systematically replaced old and small ships, which counted as units in her earlier fleet, by the most powerful and costly modern vessels." Nor, again, does the money provided by the completed law "represent the increase in cost properly attributable to the German Navy, for many charges borne on British naval funds are otherwise defrayed in Germany; and the German Navy comprises such a large portion of new ships that the cost of maintenance and repair is considerably less than in navies which have been longer established." Lord Fisher *alias* "Sleep quietly in your beds" should put that in his pipe and smoke it, for in his palmy days at the Admiralty every effort was made to minimise the development of the German Navy and to exaggerate British superiority at the very time that, thanks to him, it was slipping from our grasp. As Lord Fisher's judgment was obviously so frightfully at fault upon the general naval situation, we trust that the public will keep a sceptical eye upon the Report of the Oil Commission of which he is chairman. We must be on our guard against an impudent effort to "rush" this country into the construction of oil-propelled ships. We have no oil to speak of in these islands, whereas we have a monopoly of the finest coal in the world, and we must see that our Government does not surrender to the vested interests of the oil trade in which conspicuous Radicals are engaged. After a silver scandal we might have an oil scandal. The Memorandum already quoted ingenuously points out that the naval

expansion of Germany has not been provoked by British naval expansion, the German Government having repeatedly declared that their naval policy had not been influenced by British action. Here are the official figures: In 1905 Great Britain was building four capital ships and Germany two; in 1906 Great Britain reduced to three capital ships and Germany increased to three; in 1907 Great Britain built three capital ships and Germany built three; in 1908 Great Britain further reduced to two capital ships and Germany further increased to four. We are kindly informed that these figures "speak for themselves." They do. They also speak for the British Admiralty. They speak most eloquently for Sir John Fisher, during whose régime British naval construction sank from two keels to one in 1905 down to one keel to two in 1908. No wonder he was made a peer by the politicians. The Memorandum pathetically reminds us that "It was not until the efforts of Great Britain to procure the abatement or retardation of naval rivalry had failed for three successive years that the Admiralty was forced in 1909, upon a general review of the naval situation, to ask Parliament to take exceptional measures to secure against all possible hazards the safety of the Empire." Even "sleep quietly in your beds" was aroused for a moment from his own slumbers, but it was thanks to the protests of the Opposition and no thanks to him or Mr. Churchill, who was intriguing with Mr. Lloyd George against the Navy, that in that year eight capital ships were laid down in Great Britain, while two others were provided by the Commonwealth of Australia and the Dominion of New Zealand, being a total of ten.

Expansion Extraordinary

A VEIL is gracefully drawn over the shocking delay in the building of these ships, and the complete failure of the Admiralty, not yet rectified, to provide all the other essentials of a sea-going Fleet which are lamentably lacking, especially repairing docks on the North Sea, cruisers, destroyers, &c. Last spring "a fifth German Navy Law was assented to by the Reichstag." This is not our statement but that of the Admiralty, and it is something that Mandarins should realise the existence and expansion of the German Navy, though nothing is said as to the great assistance

afforded the German Government in passing their latest Defence Acts, by the fatuous mission of Lord Haldane to Berlin, which undid much of the good done by the firm front presented by the Triple Entente in 1911. As our readers are aware, the main feature of this new law is not so much the increase in the new construction of capital ships, "though that is important, but rather the increase in the striking force of ships of all classes which will be immediately available at all seasons of the year." Henceforward a third squadron of eight German battleships would be created and maintained in full commission as part of the active battle fleet, the result being that, whereas under the unamended law the active German battle fleet consisted of seventeen battleships and four battle-cruisers, with twelve small cruisers, it would "in the near future" consist of twenty-five battleships plus eight battle-cruisers and eighteen small cruisers, and the larger fleet would be rendered much more readily available than the smaller one. Ninety-nine torpedo-boat-destroyers instead of sixty-six would be maintained in full commission by the German Admiralty out of a total of one hundred and forty-four. Seventy-two new submarines would be built "within the currency of the new law and of these it is apparently proposed to maintain fifty-four with full permanent crews. Taking a general view, the effect of the law will be that nearly four-fifths of the entire German Navy will be maintained in full permanent commission; that is to say, instantly and constantly ready for war." So great an expansion of the German Fleet necessarily involved a great increase of personnel. In 1898 the officers and men of the German Navy numbered 25,000. To-day they number 66,000, while the new law provides for a total of 101,500, and what of the Reserves? We should like the Admiralty to publish a frank statement as regards British personnel, which would reveal an even more shocking dereliction of duty in recent years than in the matter of tons and guns. The brilliant brain of Sir John Fisher conceived the bright idea of "scrapping" ships in order to keep down men and estimates, with the result that to-day we are hopelessly undermanned and have no reserve in the event of mobilisation. The Admiralty at last recognises some of the material facts about Germany and acknowledges that the latest Navy law will produce a notable expanse of strength and readiness, but what of the

present First Lord of the Admiralty's formal but unfulfilled pledge to make an adequate reply to the German Defence Act?

The Kernel of the Matter

HERE is another grave indication set forth in the Admiralty Memorandum which once more gives the lie to the minimisers of German sea-power. The number of German battleships and large armoured cruisers "which will be kept constantly ready and in full commission will be raised by the law from twenty-one, the present figure, to thirty-three—an addition of twelve, or an increase of about 57 per cent. In the beginning the new German Fleet will include about twenty battleships and large cruisers of the older type, but gradually the fighting power of the Fleet will increase until ultimately it will consist completely of modern vessels." The complete organisation of the German Fleet will comprise five battle squadrons and a fleet flagship, making forty-one battleships in all, "each attended by a battle- or armoured-cruiser squadron, complete with small cruisers and auxiliaries of all kinds, and accompanied by numerous flotillas of destroyers and submarines." Then comes the kernel of the whole business. "This great Fleet is not dispersed all over the world for duties of commerce, protection, or in discharge of Colonial responsibilities; nor are its composition and character adapted to those purposes. It is concentrated, and kept concentrated, in close proximity to the German and British coasts." This has been the burden of the song of all those "cranks," "jingos," "scaremongers," &c., who, in season and out of season, have been ridiculed and vilified by the cocoa press and the Potsdam Party for trying to arouse their somnolent and self-complacent countrymen to realise, before it was too late, that the German Navy existed for one purpose, and one purpose alone, viz. to secure the mastery of all the seas by defeating British Sea-power in the North Sea. The Admiralty reproduce a document familiar almost to the point of nausea to the readers of this Review, viz. the preamble to the German Naval Law of 1900, which ran as follows: "In order to protect German trade and commerce under existing conditions only one thing will suffice, namely, Germany must possess a battle fleet of such a strength that even for the most powerful

naval adversary a war would involve such risks as to make that Power's own supremacy doubtful. For this purpose it is not absolutely necessary that the German Fleet should be as strong as that of the greatest naval Power, for, as a rule, a great naval Power will not be in a position to concentrate all its forces against us." This, as we have constantly said, is the only instance we know in history of a declaration of war being formally embodied in an Act of Parliament, and ever since those words became part of the law of the land in Germany she has been practically at war with us, though we have been at peace with her. Germany's wars begin not with an ultimatum but with the prolonged preparation preceding the ultimatum, as her successive victims have learnt to their cost. The Admiralty has taken the British Empire into its confidence to the extent of exposing the hideous folly on one side of the North Sea and the prodigious preparation on the other. Something more is needed besides candour in speech and in writing, viz. effective action in meeting the danger which is no longer denied. Less than ever would there seem to be room for a Potsdam Party in this country in the face of this reluctant official Peccavi, and henceforward patriotic Englishmen will be entitled to regard as suspect all those individuals who from one motive or another—whether they be ex-diplomatists or ex-administrators with an axe to grind or an old score to pay off, common or garden snobs who have been personally flattered by one or other of the Hohenzollerns, Cocoa Quakers, anti-English Englishmen or treacherous aliens—devote their energies to proving that Great Britain is the aggressor and Germany the aggrieved party in that great Anglo-German rivalry upon which we publish an exceptionally lucid and valuable contribution written from the American standpoint by a distinguished citizen of the great Republic.

Golf to Lawn Tennis

AFTER laying optimistic stress upon British superiority in "pre-Dreadnoughts" for the moment, but only for the moment, which secures us in the Mediterranean, the Canadian Government, for which we must always remember this Memorandum was primarily intended, was informed, "It is evident . . . that in the year 1915 our squadron of four battle cruisers and four armoured cruisers will not suffice to

fulfil our requirements and its whole composition must be reconsidered." The Fisher policy Overseas is thus briefly summarised. In 1902 there were 160 British vessels on the Overseas station against seventy-six to-day. The Memorandum concludes with a brief disquisition on the meaning of naval supremacy, general and local, and the rapid expansion of Canadian sea-borne trade which depends for its security upon the Imperial Navy, which "at the present time and in the immediate future" is still able, by special arrangements, to send an effective fleet of battleships and cruisers "to unite with the Royal Australian Navy and the British squadrons in China and the Pacific for the defence of British Columbia, Australia, and New Zealand." We should much like to see such a squadron get under way at the earliest possible moment in order that the Dominions might see what we can still do, though we fancy it is much easier said than done, owing to the shortage of all kinds for which recent parsimony is responsible. Anyhow, the Admiralty admit that this power "will be diminished with the growth, not only of the German Navy, but by the simultaneous building by many Powers of great modern ships of war. Whereas in the present year Great Britain possesses eighteen battleships and battle cruisers of the 'Dreadnought' class against nineteen of that class possessed by the other Powers of Europe, and will possess in 1913 twenty-four to twenty-one, the figures in 1914 will be thirty-one to thirty-three, and in the year 1915 thirty-five to fifty-one." Even this is probably a somewhat hopeful estimate, but it suggests further reflections on the wisdom of the "Dreadnought" policy, about which only one thing was certain, viz. that it must, within an appreciable period, scrap every ship which made British Sea-power unchallengeable while other Powers had comparatively little to scrap and could start afresh with a fair chance of catching us up. It is just as though a man who had always beaten his opponent at golf challenged him to play another game, say lawn tennis, which neither had ever played. The golfer would in such cases be regarded as an idiot by his friends, who would say "serve him right" if he were beaten. Even a postponement of the "Dreadnought" competition would have saved us many millions of pounds, and the fact that it is equally costly to others is poor consolation, because in the long run a Cobdenite country whose vitals are bleeding by the sheer

loss of men through emigration, must be beaten by a Protectionist country who husbands her resources.

THAT is recognised as is *shown* by the **Mother Country's appeal to** Protectionist Canada to come to her assistance. "**The Admiralty** are assured that his *Majesty's Government* **will** not hesitate to ask the House of **Commons for** whatever provision the circumstances **of each year** may require. *But the aid* which Canada **could give at the present** time is not to be measured only in ships or money. **Any action** on the part of Canada to increase the power and **mobility of the** Imperial Navy, and thus widen the margin of our **common safety**, would be recognised everywhere as a most **significant witness to** *the united strength* of the Empire and to the renewed **resolve of** the Overseas Dominions *to take their* part in **maintaining its** integrity." The last part of this paragraph is **strictly true**. The attitude of Canada and the contemplated **action of Canada**, accompanied as it has been by scenes of extraordinary **enthusiasm**, has disclosed to the world the existence of another **nation destined** to exercise a potent influence on the peace of **Europe and on the** balance of power upon which the peace rests. *In reply to an* enquiry from the *Prime Minister* of the **Dominion as to the most** effective form of immediate Canadian aid, the Admiralty "**have** no hesitation in answering, after a prolonged **consideration of all** the circumstances, that it is desirable that **such aid should in**clude the *provision* of a *certain* number of the **largest and strongest** ships of war which science can build or money **supply**." **The** response of Canada has astonished the world, **especially the** German world, which is as ignorant of us as **we are of them, for** it has been sedulously preached by German *doctrinaires* **that the** British Dominions were only awaiting the first **opportunity to** *cut the painter!* Now that the Admiralty is **prepared to admit** that previous Admiralties were anything but **infallible, won't** it take the further step of recognising the **possibility of its own** fallibility. Lord Percy's *masterly contribution* **to the problem** of National Defence should be carefully **read by the Admiralty** *as well as* by the War Office and the Defence **Committee. The** "message" of Lord Roberts cannot be ignored. **The lesson of** Waterloo is no less significant than that of **Trafalgar.**

Emergency Aid

NOTHING could be more deplorable than the recent exhibition which the First Lord of the Admiralty has made of himself.

The Bridgeman Episode

By temperament, by tradition, by instinct, Mr. Churchill is totally lacking in the qualities required in responsible positions, especially such an office as that which he now occupies. The very name "the great Silent Navy" suffices to show how utterly out of place is a mere windbag in Whitehall. The fact that he may be an industrious windbag does not increase his usefulness. On the contrary, if he were a lazier man he would be less mischievous, as the admirals would then have a chance of doing the work which they understand without the perpetual interference of an ego-maniac who insists on poking his finger into every pie and cannot conceive that anybody but himself knows anything about the Navy, though he only took the subject up a few months ago for speechmaking purposes. The bonfires alighted in the various Departments that have suffered from his presence are still burning. His fiascos elsewhere mattered comparatively little. Lord Elgin could smooth down the ruffled feelings of outraged Colonies, officials laughed at his electioneering antics at the Board of Trade, while he was regarded as a freak at the Home Office. But when you turn a man of this type loose on the Admiralty and give him *carte blanche* to lecture everybody, to insult everybody, to ignore everybody, to interfere with everybody, to black-list those who won't kow-tow to him, to job on the sycophants, grave risks are run, and as we have seen from the Fisher régime, which was not dissimilar from the Churchill régime, immense harm can be done in a very short time, though happily in such a magnificent Service the harm would very speedily be undone in the event of a change of régime. Still, one must remain very anxious while Mr. Churchill remains where he is, and that anxiety will not be diminished by the fact that he enjoys the confidence of newspapers which are prepared to sell their souls, to say nothing of the safety of the country, in return for a certain amount of personal flattery and unlimited tit-bits of "information." His latest performance is the ejection of the First Sea Lord, Sir Francis Bridgeman, an independent man who could afford to take an independent line, and to whose independence we undoubtedly owe the fact that a small instalment has been made towards

improving the pittance of the officers and men of the Navy. Such a man could not consent to play the doormat to Mr. Churchill's boot, so he was dismissed in a caddish letter unique in the annals of the Admiralty. Prince Louis of Battenberg, an admittedly able seaman, now reigns in his stead. As Prince Louis of Battenberg is also a gentleman, it will be very surprising if he knuckles down to one who was aptly described "as half an alien and wholly undesirable."

Domestic Controversy

THE Coalition is rapidly becoming a cesspool of corruption. It already stinks in the nostrils of the people. Every day some further development of Tammany Hall methods is expected, and we are rarely disappointed. To the victors the spoils. The main duty of Unionists lies in rescuing an unfortunate country from the toils of this nefarious Cabal and restoring clean government. If we had any voice in the policy of our Party we should urge this in season and out of season, but urgent as is the destruction of the Government there is no shadow of an excuse for the Unionist Party to abandon its own principles, and we should become objects of general contempt and derision besides giving the Government a new lease of power if we listened to false or craven counsels. On the contrary, we should proclaim our faith in season and out of season. As the *National Review* has done its share in the past in discussing the domestic affairs of Unionism we feel little temptation to enter a fresh controversy, which appears to have been got up mainly for the delectation of the enemy and for the purpose of diverting attention from Ministerial misdeeds. Some Unionist newspapers so-called, instead of attacking and exposing the Demagogues, appear to be working for the Demagogues and certainly miss no opportunity of booming them. The truth is, and it is well that the truth should sometimes be told, that a certain section of the Unionist Press is peculiarly susceptible to Radical influences, being largely staffed by convinced Radicals, and partially owned by men of the same persuasion or nominal Unionists with Radical leanings. This explains many otherwise inexplicable incidents. Radical newspapers are exclusively owned, edited, sub-edited, written, and managed by Radicals, and any one who is not of the true faith is speedily squeezed out. Unionist journals are occasionally con-

ducted on a different plan, and as we have said are honeycombed with Radicalism. The proprietor may be a Radical—if not outwardly, at heart. Occasionally the editor is a Radical. The manager may be a Radical. Sub-editors are frequently Radicals; ditto news editors. Also news agencies. The vitality of Unionism is demonstrated by its extraordinary success in fighting against powerful adverse influences on its own side. The opponents of Tariff Reform are once more on the war-path, and in spite of the explicit declarations of Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Bonar Law at the Albert Hall, that as the offer of a Referendum had been rejected at the polls, the Unionist Party is now free to give effect to its policy when it comes into power without further delay, fresh efforts are being made to resume that disastrous experiment which was largely responsible for our check at the last General Election.

The Fear of Ure

OTHERS would frankly abandon the policy of Preference for fear of what Mr. Ure might say about it, but as they were never in favour of Preference and worked like niggers for Canadian-American reciprocity last year, they remain where they were, just as we remain where we were. We might as well abandon the defence of the Church and the Union or any other Unionist cause, as Mr. Ure is equally eloquent and equally mendacious on all subjects. Should he be invited to determine our policy? As regards the Referendum there is one section of opinion for which we confess to having immense respect and regard, because it has proved its sincerity and determination to make sacrifices, viz. the Ulster Unionists. As quotations are occasionally somewhat "sketchy" we won't vouch for the following, but the *Belfast Newsletter* is gleefully quoted by the enemies of Tariff Reform as saying "Tariff Reform can afford to wait; the cause of the maintenance of the Union cannot wait." While *The Northern Whig* is quoted as saying "It is not yet too late to renew the Referendum pledge, and if it is renewed the Unionists will sweep the country at the next election." Such opinions from such a quarter are entitled to be heard, because amid many uncertain and dubious factors the integrity of Ulster Unionism is beyond all question. But we should reply to our respected contemporaries—and the present writer can speak from considerable platform experience at the last General

Election—that so far from "sweeping the country" with the Referendum, that unhappy word is Greek to the vast mass of the people, and the British always resent what they do not understand. The Union would above all causes stand to suffer if we reshouldered the Referendum. We would remind Ulster that Tariff Reform is the only tie between thousands and hundreds of thousands of working-class voters and the Unionist Party many of whom, if Tariff Reform were shelved again, would finally abandon the Unionists as a "party of rotters" and become "whole-hogging" Socialists, while in any case they would unhesitatingly vote Radical and Home Rule at the next election, with dire consequences to the Union as well as the Unionist Party. On the question of faith and principle, which has been so eloquently and splendidly dealt with by Mr. Garvin in the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *Observer*, we need say nothing further. Parties have generally gained by sticking to their principles, but they have always lost, and deservedly, by deserting them for tactical reasons, and so long as Mr. Bonar Law is our Leader we may feel confident that the flag will remain flying. Here are his own words:

> For nine years we have advocated Preference as a step towards Imperial unity, and in my opinion at least this is not the time to abandon that policy after the elections in Canada last year—which caused an outburst of Imperial sentiment which impressed and, I believe, astonished the world. Still less is it the time when the Colonies are moving with such magnificent spirit to help us in the defence of the Empire. For nine years we have kept the flag flying, and if there is any sincerity in political life at all this is not the time and, at all events, I am not the man to haul down that flag.

A Word from Toronto

In view of the deliberate attempt, not for the first time, to falsify the opinion of the Dominions we quote from the Toronto correspondent of the *Times*, who has frequently to intervene in order to dispel the mists of misrepresentation created by interested parties. He tells us that the Canadian Conservative Leaders have no idea of going to London to bargain for Preference in British markets. No intelligent Englishman ever thought they would, but unfortunately the Union Jackass is somewhat conspicuous at the present time. It is not a question of bargaining here or bargaining there, but of each member of the Empire doing its utmost to give advantages to other parts of the King's Dominions. Preference

means what it says, namely, that we prefer dealing with our own kinsmen Overseas, and that we show that preference by concessions in our market. As the *Times* Toronto correspondent adds:

> The view of Canadian Preferentialists is that Great Britain should fix and control her own duties, with a preference to the Dominions over foreign countries similar to that granted to the Mother Country by Canada. Whatever may be said to the contrary, it is chiefly for Imperial reasons that the Canadian preference was established, and, unless British statesmen believe that the interests of the Empire would be promoted by trade concessions to the Colonies, no action in this direction is to be expected. Many of the foremost Imperialists believe that the future unity and integrity of the Empire depend upon preferential trade alliances between the Mother Country and the Dominions rather than upon common movements for defence or even common Imperial sentiment. Whether this view be sound or not, it is certain that British Unionists must convince the British people of the Imperial value of Preference, and not impose the responsibility of continuing or advocating this policy upon the backs of people in the Dominion.

Who has invented the legend that "Canada does not want Preference." Canadians should know that Canadians in this country disloyal to the Dominions are busily spreading it just as they plumped for Reciprocity.

The *Canadian Gazette* does well to remind us:

> When submitting his naval proposals to the Canadian Parliament Mr Borden said what we all must feel: "It seems most essential that there should be such a co-operation in Defence and Trade as to give the whole Empire an effective organisation. The two objects are inseparable."

Misconception

THERE is one somewhat delicate topic on which a word must be said in spite of the sensitiveness of newpsapers to any criticism, although they live by criticism. Immense irritation is occasionally caused in Unionist circles by what are described as "the vagaries of the *Daily Mail*" and its illustrious consort the *Times*, and we confess to having occasionally shared this annoyance, which is nevertheless founded upon a misunderstanding now happily cleared up. The *Daily Mail*, which ought to know, has specifically declared that "the *Times* occupies a national and non-party position." That is to say the *Times* is not a Unionist paper in the accepted sense of the term, though incidentally it may be opposed to the present Home Rule Bill. Unionists are therefore unreasonable in resenting what they regard as sins of omission or commission on

its part as the *Times* does not even profess to be of their Party. The *Daily Mail* again has never pretended to be primarily political. It caters for the vast mass of non-politicians, and we feel sure that its controlling genius, Lord Northcliffe—who is a real genius as a man of business—would be the first to say "the *Daily Mail* is not a Party paper." Unionists are as foolish to object to the political attitude of two papers which disclaim their politics as they would be in resenting the attitude of the *Manchester Guardian* or the *Daily News*. It suits the Radical Press to quote the *Times* and *Daily Mail* against the Unionist Party, but those are the transparent dodges of political partisans. The *Westminster Gazette* lives by them, having no ideas of its own. It should be a great advantage to the country to have influential and popular papers detached from Party politics—provided they are not perverted from their chosen course by charlatans adept in "nobbling the Press"—but it is a decided disadvantage to a Party to take its principles from those who do not pretend to be in it or of it, and need not necessarily have the interests of the Party at heart. There might *e.g.* be a scheme afoot originating at the Admiralty, to break up the Unionist Party in order to place the country under the heel of Mr. Churchill. Now we don't suggest for a moment that intelligent organs like the *Times* and the *Daily Mail* would carry their worship of the Windbag to this point, but supposing they convinced themselves that he is our only statesman, would Unionists be compelled to say ditto? By no means even though the *Westminster Gazette* advised us to do so.

The R.P.E.

THAT the Radical Plutocracy Enquiry has come to stay was shown by another largely attended meeting held in one of the Committee Rooms of the House of Commons on December 12, presided over in the first instance by Sir Frederick Banbury and subsequently by Mr. George Wyndham. The following report of the Acting Honorary Secretary was read. We quote it as published in the *Times*:

There is every reason to congratulate ourselves on the results of the Radical Plutocracy Enquiry, informally initiated at the House of Commons on October 31. The work has progressed steadily and unostentatiously, with the happiest consequences, not the least satisfactory feature being that for the first time the Radical Plutocracy

have been made to realise the grotesqueness of their position. The man in the street can fully appreciate the absurdity of a Plutocrat who tries to divide the nation into "haves" and "haves not," who stirs up the latter against the former class, to which he himself belongs, and gathers his reward in the shape of a princely salary, if he be a Minister, or in the form of peerages, governorships, baronetcies, knighthoods, and Privy Councillorships. Meanwhile these Radical Plutocrats, while thanking their stars that they are not as the wicked Tories, who are represented by Mr. Lloyd George as the party of millionaires, while the Radicals are the professed champions of the oppressed, have made no effort to square their practices with his preaching. They are not infrequently inconsiderate and neglectful landlords, hard-fisted employers, sweaters, offensive to their so-called "inferiors," cosmopolitan financiers of vast wealth, working against the interests of a country in which they provide a minimum of employment.

So far we have only touched the fringe of the question, namely, the problem of honours, with somewhat astonishing results. It is now necessary to take a step forward and place the Radical Plutocracy Enquiry on a broader and permanent basis—to choose a chairman and a secretary—while carefully avoiding any addition to the number of superfluous leagues.

"The meeting decided, in view of Mr. Lloyd George's threatened crusade against landowners, to institute a vigorous and searching enquiry into the administration of the numerous properties belonging to members of his Majesty's Ministry, inside and outside the Cabinet, and the supporters of the Coalition, with a view to ascertaining whether Mr. Lloyd George's colleagues and followers live up to the standards prescribed for Tory landlords by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In every instance the original landowner would be served with notice that his case was being investigated, and with a copy of the questions in circulation." A thoroughly representative and capable Committee was appointed to carry out the work of the Radical Plutocracy Enquiry with Mr. G. Lane-Fox as Chairman, consisting of the following Members of Parliament: The Hon. W. Ormsby Gore, Mr. Herbert Nield, the Hon. E. Wood, Lord Winterton, Lord Wolmer, Mr. Charles Bathurst, Major Archer-Shee, Mr. J. A. Grant, the Hon. Walter Guinness, Mr. H. Barnston, and Lord Lewisham, Major Archer-Shee being chosen as hon. secretary. Among sympathetic comments upon the new movement may be noted those of the *Outlook* which has led public opinion on the Marconi question, the *Saturday Review* which detests shams, and the *Spectator* (December 14) which observed: "We note with great pleasure that a meeting of the Radical Plutocracy Enquiry, which was held at the House

of Commons on Thursday afternoon, was largely attended. After referring to the resolution already quoted, our contemporary adds:

> The movement began in a joke, but we see no reason why this attempt to unveil the disgusting hypocrisy of these posing Plutocrats, who try to pass themselves off as earnest and simple-living working men, and wear the red cap studded with diamonds, should not lead to sound practical results. We have already seen those who profess to regard betting as the most demoralising of social evils complacently purchasing and maintaining a paper which is full of furious incitements to betting. We shall not be surprised if the promised Enquiry discloses moral situations equally remarkable. "The Sikhs have asked for war, and by Heaven they shall have it."

Land Frauds.

THE Committee of the Radical Plutocracy Enquiry were not slow in getting to work, and on December 18 the following communications were sent to the Press, viz. a covering letter to landlords belonging to or supporting the present Government and *ex hypothesi* countenancing Mr. Lloyd George's methods and objects together with a set of homely questions concerning the administration of their own properties. We publish these documents textually.

(Covering letter to Radical landowners)

Radical Plutocracy Enquiry,
Temporary Offices, 23 Ryder Street,
St. James's, London, S.W.

SIR,—We beg to inform you that an enquiry is being set on foot concerning Radical landlords, and as the subject may possibly interest or affect you, we think it only right and fair to send you a copy of the questions which we are circulating among persons likely to be able to collect the required information. We would lay stress on the fact that there is nothing clandestine in our investigation. All is open and above board, and we shall be very much obliged for any light you may be able to throw on a subject which in consequence of Mr. Lloyd George's speeches excites an ever-increasing amount of public interest.—We beg to remain, yours faithfully,

THE HON. SECRETARY, RADICAL PLUTOCRACY ENQUIRY.

You will note that the following injunction has been issued to enquirers:

N.B.—Enquirers should remember that absolute accuracy is of the utmost importance in order that this Enquiry may serve its purpose. When they are in doubt as to the correct answers to any of these questions, or to other questions to be subsequently circulated, they should make it a point of honour to give the subjects of the Enquiry (i.e. Radical landlords) the benefit of the doubt.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING RADICAL LANDOWNERS

SIR,—Are there any Radical landowners in your neighbourhood or in neighbourhoods with which you are acquainted? Are any of them Members of the present

Government? Have any of them become Peers, Baronets, Privy Councillors, &c., since November 1905?

What is their local attitude towards the Land question?

How does the administration of Radical estates within your knowledge compare with the administration of other estates in the same neighbourhood? What steps have such Radical landlords taken as regards land under their control to stop the drift of population into the towns? To what extent have they increased the amenities of village life? Have they been active in building cottages, generous in letting them at a low rent, and careful in keeping them in good repair?

Are their rents, generally speaking, higher or lower or equal to rents on adjoining estates? Where lower, is this owing to large game preservation?

Do Radical landlords whom you know pay a "living wage" to their labourers? What weekly wages do they pay?

Do they put political pressure upon their "dependents" to support the present Government? If so, give instances.

Can you give instances of men being turned out of their farms, holdings, or cottages because their opinions are displeasing to their Radical landlords, or owing to disputes arising from differences over the preservation of game? Do you know of Radical estates on which enquiry is made as to the political opinions of those seeking tenancy or employment?

Are all the schools under Radical control equally available for political meetings on either side during a General Election or at any other time?

To what extent have Radical landlords within your knowledge helped the inhabitants of adjoining towns "back to the land" by means of small holdings? How far have any acted on the policy proclaimed by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman on becoming Prime Minister in 1905, that the pheasant would be replaced by the peasant?

Do you know of cases in which Radical landowners have replaced the peasant or farmer by the pheasant and the gamekeeper, or in which they have consolidated properties for the purpose of creating game preserves or deer parks in unsuitable countries? Has any considerable acreage in consequence gone out of cultivation, with consequent diminution of agricultural employment?

If any Radical landlords in your neighbourhood are large game preservers, please make exhaustive enquiries concerning the system on which their shooting-parties are conducted, and to what extent they give away their game at or near elections?

To what extent do their humbler neighbours have access to Radical parks or pleasure-grounds?

Do you know of Radical landlords closing, or seeking to close, old footpaths or other rights of way or encroaching on commons?

Is there any demand for small holdings in the neighbourhood of Radical estates? Please furnish any instances in which this demand has been met by the splitting up of Radical properties or of Radical parks, or on the contrary has been refused?

I beg to remain, yours faithfully,

THE HON. SECRETARY, RADICAL PLUTOCRACY ENQUIRY.

N.B.—Enquirers should remember that absolute accuracy is of the utmost importance in order that this Enquiry may serve its purpose. When they are in doubt as to the correct answers to any of these questions, or to other questions to be subsequently

circulated, they should make it a point of honour to give the subjects of the Enquiry (i.e. Radical landlords) the benefit of the doubt.

All information should for the present be sent to the Honorary Secretary (Major Archer-Shee, M.P.), Radical Plutocracy Enquiry temporary offices, 23 Ryder Street, St. James's, London, S.W.

Radical Tributes

THERE could be no more eloquent tribute to the work of the Radical Plutocracy Enquiry, which is only commencing operations, than the attitude of the Radical Press. Our "sea-green incorruptible" contemporary, the *Westminster Gazette*—of which Sir Alfred Moritz Mond, a plutocrat of plutocrats, credited with an unencumbered ducal income of several hundred thousand pounds a year, is the managing director,—is afraid to publish any literature issued by the R.P.E., though it should be peculiarly interesting to the Radical snobocracy, of which the *Westminster Gazette* is the recognised mouthpiece. The *Daily News and Morning Leader* published a column of comment by a Member of Parliament, who as a professional clown makes a pathetic effort day by day to be funny without being vulgar, though he rarely succeeds in either object. But neither the *Daily News* nor the *Morning Leader*—two single gentlemen rolled into one—have dared to publish either the questions concerning the shameless shower of "Honours" since the democratic debauchery began seven years ago, nor those calculated to ascertain to what extent the Lloyd George landed nobility endeavour to live up to the Lloyd George land creed. The *Daily Chronicle*, which, to its credit be it said, has not participated so far as we know in the "Honours" debauch, which is largely responsible for the general corruption and deterioration of the Press, has ventured to publish the questions about honours, but not those concerning Radical landowners. The *Nation*, which is all bark and no bite, emulates the *Westminster Gazette* and other organs of the Cocoa Press prefer to abuse the R.P.E. rather than give publicity to its work. The *Manchester Guardian*, which though in many ways the most extreme and hostile of Radical papers, nevertheless does something to maintain the declining standard of British journalism, puts its cowardly Radical contemporaries to shame by giving its readers fitful glimpses of an enterprise which we venture to predict will make

domestic politics infinitely more interesting than they are at present. When the whole story is told the public will appreciate the colossal fraud perpetrated upon them during many years by the talented hypocrites of the so-called party of progress, which is the nearest approach to Tammany Hall Government yet seen in this country. Even a cursory glance at the record of the Radical plutocracy indicates how vast and fertile is the field of enquiry in which all good citizens of either party, who prefer clean to corrupt government, should co-operate unless they wish to see this country sink to the level of the lesser South American Republics.

Betting "Tips"

THE *Spectator* has waged single-handed a valiant campaign against those millionaires of the Cocoa Press, who, while avowedly regarding betting as one of the worst social evils, nevertheless own organs, or shall we say "rags," which are mainly incitements to the poorer classes to bet. The R.P.E. might profitably ascertain the net results to any working man over a given period who followed the betting "tips" of the *Star*, which caters primarily for the working classes, and *ex hypothesi* has diverted an immense sum of money from the maintenance of humble homes into the pockets of bookmakers. Then we have our old friend "The Free Trade Press" so-called, which is inexpressibly shocked at any proposal to restrict foreign competition, and especially by any suggestion of a readjustment of food duties with a view to increasing employment in this country and consolidating the British Empire. Preferential duties are denounced as the "taxation of the food of the people," and as according to Cobdenite organs the whole of every duty comes out of the consumer's pocket, while the price of the entire supply of the article in question is raised by the full amount of such duties, it would be intensely interesting to ascertain how many millions the cocoa magnates have "transferred from the pockets of the people," in the popular phrase, by the cocoa and chocolate duties which survived several decades without serious protest from the Cadbury Press, and were only finally changed for platform purposes. It would be no less interesting to know where our cocoa kings now obtain their supplies of raw material, and to investigate the conditions of the labouring population in those regions, as also to ascertain to what extent

great Radical fortunes have been tainted by "slavery" as well by as "protection." The stony silence of the *Westminster Gazette* as to how far the business practices of its proprietors accord with its own immaculate dogmas upon the beneficence of unrestricted competition, is suggestive. Sir Alfred Moritz Mond has artlessly admitted that he does not carry his politics into business. It is equally the case with "the people's Baronet" and "the people's Privy Councillor," Sir John Brunner—by the way, when is the gross inequality between these two great men, of whom one is and one is not a Privy Councillor, going to be redressed? They deserve well of their party if not of their country. It is magnificent to be Protectionists in practice and Free Traders by profession, which means Protection for one's own products and Free Trade in other people's. This is indeed an ideal position, but it should moderate the pretensions of the *Westminster Gazette* as an organ of light and leading; and whenever it publishes a smug self-righteous article denouncing the wickedness of Tariff Reformers and describing Protection as the enrichment of the rich at the expense of the poor, its readers should write and invite the editor to reconcile these beautiful theories with the operations of Messrs. Brunner, Mond and Co., whose principals admit to not carrying their politics into business.

Prospects of Plutocrats

BUT may not Messrs. Bruner Mond carry their business into politics in opposing a policy which would tend to equalise the conditions between British manufacturers by a reasonable measure of Protection for all, in lieu of Cobdenism, which affords invidious Protection to favoured monopolies? We have already encouraged the *Westminster Gazette*, of which we understand that Sir Alfred Moritz Mond is still the Managing Director, to expound this riddle, which might equally be dealt with by the *English Review*, which is alleged to be the sole property of the same patriot. Failing these, we should be glad to afford the Treasurer of "Free Trade for other people" an opportunity of putting himself right with the public in our pages. The questions addressed to him during his tour in Canada remain unanswered to this day, and until they are answered it will be assumed they cannot be answered. Sir Alfred Moritz Mond cannot escape a plain duty on the ground that he

is too busy destroying the Church in Wales, or immersed in other equally beneficent operations, for he is ever ready with a letter to his own newspaper on the merits of "Free Trade for other people," and on December 17 the *Westminster Gazette* printed two columns of correspondence between its Managing Director and Lord Lansdowne under the suggestive heading "The Consumer Pays." Did the consumer pay the cocoa and chocolate duties? Would the consumer of chemicals or nickel "pay" in the event of arrangements being entered into by a nickel trust or chemical combine in this country to restrict foreign competition? If not, why not? If, on the other hand, the consumer does "pay" for such restrictive arrangements with foreign competitors, have chemical or nickel magnates any moral right to finance Free Trade newspapers? Lord Lansdowne was too polite to ask a home question, but politeness may be carried too far in dealing with Radical plutocrats. They cannot be allowed to have the best of both worlds. Plutocrats we can understand and demagogues we can understand, but the plutocratic demagogue who devotes his time and money to exciting the passions of the people against those who are infinitely less rich than himself though belonging to the class into which he is anxious to creep, or if inarticulate or incapable himself pays other people to do his dirty work, is an anachronism long out of date. Unless we much mistake the rising temper of this country the Radical plutocracy will receive very different treatment in the future to what they have done in the past. They will have to mind their p's and q's, while those among them, and they are numerous, of alien extraction who have apparently effected a lodgment in this unhappy land in order to do the utmost harm to everything which makes for our greatness and prosperity, and support financially and otherwise every movement calculated to injure or ruin us, will find themselves in the position of unwelcome guests. Many of them have outrageously abused the excessive hospitality which has been so generously and foolishly lavished upon them. Much has been said, much has been written, about the pauper alien, and in many places he is a curse and a pest, but he is nothing like so dangerous to national well-being or to our national security as plutocratic aliens who divide their energies between maintaining a fiscal system which sweats the English-

man for the benefit of the foreigner and intriguing on behalf of the beloved Fatherland, though curiously enough several of them have not even the excuse that they are of German origin.

"Honours"

The distribution of what used to be regarded as "Honours" under the régime of Mr. Asquith, who has good grounds for sharing the view of Sir Robert Walpole that "all those men" (*i.e.* Radicals) "have their price," is sufficiently scandalous to arouse occasional murmurs in the cocoa Press. Thus, the *Nation* was lately moved to observe, "We suppose that never in the history of Party have 'Honours' been distributed with so lavish a hand as during the last three or four years. . . . We should be afraid to say how many peerages, baronetcies, and knighthoods, have been allotted to Liberals under the last three administrations. Many of them represent faithful or even distinguished services of character or energy. Of one or two others—notably of a recent Privy Councillorship—the less said the better, save that they have put an unnecessary strain on the compliance of the Crown." This cryptic remark not unnaturally provoked some speculation among the curious. Though we could never hope to penetrate the mind of the *Nation* we note that a recent batch of Privy Councillors contains the name of the Rt. Honourable Sir Henry Dalziel, M.P., who, according to the new *Who's Who*, is Managing Director of *Reynolds's Newspaper*, an organ notorious for the dissemination of mendacious and malicious gossip, doubtless collected from the servants' halls of the Radical plutocracy. Two years ago the new Privy Councillor, already a Knight, was vociferously demanding the resignation of Mr. Asquith as a miserable weakling unworthy to lead Radical stalwarts. But the new Privy Councillor nowadays roars as gently as any sucking dove, or, to vary the metaphor, he is one of the "tame cats" of the Coalition. The present writer recently bought a copy of *Reynolds's Newspaper* (December 15) to see the effect of its promotion to be an organ of the Privy Council upon its contents. The column entitled "Secret History of To-day" remains, from which we cull a few gems taken at random.

In all probability the attempt to hush up a serious incident which occurred last week in London will fail. Already the police have been given a hint as to what has

happened and will be represented at the inquest. If the facts which have come to the knowledge of the Authorities prove correct, then a big sensation is in store for the public.

* * * *

A case in which the parties concerned are a Society lady, an Army officer, and a wealthy son of the people, will be heard within the next few days. Pictures are said to be the cause of the dispute, and fraud is alleged.

* * * *

At a large seaport town gossip is busy just now with the names of a wealthy merchant and an accomplished lady. It is commented as rather peculiar that their visits to London, which are frequent, are always made at the same time. Rumour has it that the gentleman's wife will shortly seek the aid of the Courts.

* * * *

More is likely to be heard of the adventure of a well-known sporting man in Hyde Park a few evenings ago.

* * * *

The fact that a famous Society beauty finds American cocktails a refreshing beverage, and is not afraid to call for them herself, has greatly shocked some of her friends.

* *

Reynolds's Nobleman

SUCH is the journalism which Mr. Asquith, a highly educated and intellectual man with a wide knowledge of, and a fine taste in literature, singles out for distinction in order to muzzle a recalcitrant "follower." Whether this was the Privy Councillorship described by the *Nation* as putting "an unnecessary strain on the compliance of the Crown" we cannot say, but if his Majesty's Privy Council is to be taken seriously there can be no two opinions on the episode. This type of journalism, which is rapidly developing, is a public humiliation, and the Prime Minister sins against the light in recommending its recognition. It is an outrage upon the Crown and the Privy Council, and an affront to the more reputable portion of the Press. But what of his Majesty's personal advisers? The King cannot be expected to acquaint himself with all the poisonous rubbish printed within his Dominions, but there is surely some one about the Court with sufficient knowledge and intelligence to protect the "compliance of the Crown" from thus being "strained." Among the tit-bits in *Reynolds's Newspaper* is yet another which we cannot resist reproducing. It is taken from the same column, "Secret History of To-day," and runs as follows: "Who is the nobleman who has instructed his steward to indiscriminately discharge the old lodge keepers and other aged dependents on one of his estates without the slightest regard or provision for their

future welfare?" Any child could answer this question. The "nobleman" is undoubtedly some conspicuous member of the Lloyd George nobility, lately made a hereditary peer in return for a substantial contribution to the Radical Party fund. When your Radical plutocrat who has spent his life in vilifying the peerage at last attains his ambition and becomes a Peer, he frequently buys an estate, if possible from some other Peer, and proceeds to evict families who have lived in their farms or cottages all their lives, sometimes for several generations, in order to make a great game preserve with a view of "topping" some competitive Radical plutocrat in the number of pheasants annually slaughtered. There should consequently be little difficulty in detecting the "nobleman" of *Reynolds's Newspaper*.

A Hint from Norway

THE manner in which the Fountain of Honour has been polluted for party purposes during recent years has disgusted every decent element in the community regardless of party. We may learn something from Norway. According to the *Daily Telegraph's* Copenhagen correspondent (*see Daily Telegraph* of December 21) public sentiment is growing in favour of the abolition of "honours" which there take the form of decorations. Even Norwegian politicians are hostile. They must be very different from ours. In the recently elected Storthing no less than eighty-two members who control a majority have already submitted an amendment to the Constitution on this question. We are told that considerable sensation has been created by the action of a strong Conservative, a Cabinet Minister and ex-Speaker, Mr. Thorne, in recently returning to the King the Grand Cross of Saint Olaf, the highest distinction in Norway. Mr. Thorne has rendered his country great services at the time of the separation from Sweden. According to the correspondent responsible for these statements, "Mr. Thorne thanks his Majesty many times for the great honour, adding that he sends the decoration back, as in doing so he believes he is merely doing his duty as a Norwegian citizen." What do the Lloyd George nobility say to that? What do the Radical plutocracy say? Why is the Radical Press silent on this democratic movement? What a relief for all parties to be rid of the "Honours" problem. What a respite for prime

ministers. What a holiday for kings. Let us hope that the New Year may begin without a crop of despicable Barons, dubious Privy Councillors, bounding Baronets, and Knights galore who may have served their Party not wisely but too well.

Bombay

THE *Daily Mail* (December 16) is responsible for the following statement: "It is rumoured that after all Sir Frederick Ponsonby may not go to Bombay as Governor, as was announced in these columns a few days ago; it is said that the King is very anxious to retain his services as Private Secretary. It is also reported that Lord Glenconner may be appointed Governor of Bombay." We have no knowledge as to the facts in the foregoing paragraph, for which the *Daily Mail* must take the responsibility; but it was undoubtedly believed and generally asserted that Sir Frederick Ponsonby would become the new Governor of Bombay, and it was rumoured that several other changes would occur at Court, including the well-earned retirement of Lord Knollys. But now comes this bombshell from the *Daily Mail*. Who is this Lord Glenconner "anyway," as Americans say? We doubt whether one in a thousand of our readers could answer this question, nor could one in a million specify his qualifications for Bombay. His biography in *Who's Who* for once fails to throw light on the mystery. This nobleman, when a commoner, made several unsuccessful efforts to enter Parliament until he found Salisbury in a melting mood during the Unionist *débâcle* of 1906 and scraped into the House of Commons, but only to be ejected at the first opportunity (1910); after which he received the usual consolation allotted to Radical plutocrats rejected by the people in the shape of a hereditary peerage, and for a brief moment occupied the exalted position of Lord High Commissioner to General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. According to *Who's Who*, Lord Glenconner owns over 5000 acres of land—which can scarcely be a recommendation in Mr. Lloyd George's eyes, unless they be split up into a thousand five-acre plots, a subject on which we have no evidence. Why has the *Daily Mail* nominated Lord Glenconner to the Governorship of Bombay? At the end of his biography in *Who's Who* may be found the suggestive instruction, "See also The Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith," and further research reveals the

interesting fact that Lord Glenconner is the brother-in-law of the Prime Minister. Query. If he becomes Governor of Bombay will it be because he is the best available man for that important position, or will it be due to his relationship to the powers-that-be? We shall never know.

Abolishing Poverty

MR. LLOYD GEORGE pleasantly announced in the course of a recent speech in Aberdeen, "I am going to abolish poverty." As he had previously informed the community that if wealth were properly distributed every family in the country would have £200 a year, optimists might have imagined, after his declaration at Aberdeen, that the first measure of the coming Session would be a Bill to bring the salaries of Cabinet Ministers more in conformity with the Chancellor of the Exchequer's creed and the people's need, thus reducing the huge sums a groaning country pays its politicians for the tragic mismanagement of national business. Even well-informed men hardly realise the princely salaries—which needless to say have been augmented under the present régime—our democrats draw from the public purse, and the following table will be found instructive:

	£
Mr. Asquith (First Lord of the Treasury)	5000
Viscount Haldane (Lord Chancellor)	10,000
Viscount Morley of Blackburn (Lord President of the Council)	2000
The Marquess of Crewe (Secretary of State for India)	5000
Mr. McKenna (Home Secretary)	5000
Sir Edward Grey (Foreign Secretary)	5000
Mr. L. V. Harcourt (Colonial Secretary)	5000
"Colonel" Seely (War Secretary)	5000
Mr. Lloyd George (Chancellor of the Exchequer)	5000
Mr Churchill (First Lord of the Admiralty)	4500
Mr. McKinnon Wood (Secretary for Scotland)	2000
Mr. Sydney Buxton (President of the Board of Trade)	5000
Mr. John Burns (President Local Government Board)	5000
Mr. Walter Runciman (President Board of Agriculture)	2000
Mr. Pease (President Board of Education)	2000
Mr. Hobhouse (Chancellor of the Duchy)	2000
Mr. A. Birrell (Chief Secretary for Ireland)	4425
Mr. Herbert Samuel (Postmaster-General)	2500
Earl Beauchamp (First Commissioner of Works)	2000
Sir Rufus Daniel Isaacs (Attorney-General)	7000 (fees extra)

What a chance these munificent sums—squandered upon in-different administrators, whose chief qualification for office is the gift of the gab—offer Mr. Lloyd George to show that for once he means what he says. Let him forthwith introduce a Bill to place the Government on a purely democratic basis, giving every Minister £200 a year, which, as we have seen, according to the statement of Mr. Lloyd George to popular audiences would be the utmost he is legitimately entitled to. In that case the Cabinet would at any rate have the satisfaction of feeling that they were no longer plundering the people, and the country would applaud a transaction equally thrifty and honourable, while the substantial saving effected would be some set-off against the payment of Members of Parliament and might profitably be devoted to increasing the miserable pittances of the officers and men of the British Navy. Self-sacrifice is always impressive and popular, and henceforward no one can accuse us of withholding advice from the Government which, if acted upon, would endear them to the nation.

"Titanic" Expenditure

PENDING Mr. Lloyd George's promised effort to "abolish poverty" it must be conceded that he is generous in abolishing any poverty from which lawyers may be suffering, as may be gathered from the recently issued details of the cost of the *Titanic* Enquiry, which cost the taxpayer £20,000. The Treasury must have passed the account issued by the Board of Trade. The salary of the Wreck Commissioner, Lord Mersey, the very able judge who presided over the Enquiry, will strike no one as excessive, namely a thousand guineas; while the salary of his secretary, who must have done an enormous amount of hard and thankless work, was a beggarly £125. The Assessors' remuneration and travelling expenses are not immoderate, namely £950 17s. 2d., and though the cost of shorthand writing is £622 15s. 6d. there was probably a lot of it. The hall was hired for £360, while £934 13s. was spent on stationery and printing (less proceeds of sale of Report and evidence)—a figure suggesting wastage. But these items are completely eclipsed by the gigantic fees of the "Counsel for the Board of Trade." Sir Rufus Isaacs, Attorney-General, was actually paid £2458 2s., whilst Sir J. A. Simon, the Solicitor-General, received £2425 4s.

As Law Officers of the Crown, these eminent and learned gentlemen already receive, the Attorney-General £7000 and the Solicitor-General £6000, so they managed to "mop up" another £5000 for somewhat exiguous services. We are aware of course that we risk exasperating lawyers by calling attention to lawyers' fees, but really the matter has got altogether beyond a joke, and this particular incident attains the dimensions of a public scandal, to which some of our readers may be disposed to reply, "there are so many scandals at the present time that one more or less does not matter." We are not for the moment criticising the big fees paid to the other distinguished lawyers engaged upon this affair, Mr. Aspinall, K.C., £2345 12s.; Mr. Rowlatt, £1249 3s. 6d.; Mr. Raymond Asquith, £864, though we cannot help noting that the fee of the fortunate Junior Counsel, was actually within £200 of the salary of the presiding judge, Lord Mersey.

The Use of Law Officers

We are all for the proper and even generous remuneration of difficult work, such as that undertaken by the *Titanic* Enquiry, but the real responsibility lay upon the Judge, while the plums went to the politicians. There were big payments made to solicitors and others which were doubtless earned. It is idle to expect the House of Commons to deal faithfully with these amazing accounts. Light might usefully be thrown upon some of the other big cases in which the Law Officers have been engaged, so that we tax-paying simpletons may have an inkling as to where we stand in such matters now that the House of Commons has lost all control over public business and the Government is largely in the hands of "gentlemen of the long robe." We should also like to know what the public gets in return for the £7000 a year and the £6000 a year paid respectively to the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General, as we know that their invaluable opinions were not asked on the intricate legal conundrums arising out of the much-debated Marconi Agreement, and we have yet to learn what expert assistance was invoked by our ingenuous Post Office in its dealings with the astute Mr. Godfrey Isaacs.

We shall say nothing further for the moment upon the Marconi mystery, upon which a Select Committee of the House of Commons is still engaged, though we are bound in justice to Mr. W. R. Lawson, to whom the public are immensely indebted for his illumination of a strange affair, to deal with a characteristic performance of Mr. Herbert Samuel, the Postmaster-General. In answering a question in the House of Commons on November 21, Mr. Samuel stated that "These statements (namely that the Marconi tender had been practically accepted in January) which have appeared in the *National Review* and have been reproduced textually in the *Spectator* are totally false, like so much else that has been written with reference to this contract. No agreement of any kind was made with the Marconi Company with respect to these negotiations until March 7, 1912, when their tender in general terms was accepted, the contract itself being signed on July 19. I have made no reference to any tender having been signed in January." As Mr. Lawson, who was responsible for these statements in the *National Review*, which were reproduced in the *Spectator*, has since pointed out in a letter to the Chairman of the Select Committee, "I think it my duty to call your attention to an attempt that has been made in the House of Commons to discredit my evidence in advance." Mr. Lawson adduced the "following conclusive proofs" of the accuracy of the statement which Mr. Herbert Samuel characteristically described as "totally false." In the first place he quoted the following passage from the Postmaster-General's speech in the House of Commons on October 11 on the motion for the appointment of a Marconi Committee. "Under these circumstances, is there any man in the House, no matter how prejudiced he may be, who is now prepared to get up and say I was wrong in refusing to make that contract (with the Poulsen Company) in January, and in taking the only other course possible? (acceptance of the Marconi tender)." Then again, during the same speech, the Postmaster-General said of the Cables Landing Rights Committee that "on January 24, 1912, it approved the price to be paid, the royalty to be given to the (Marconi) Company and the period of years during which the agreement should run." Also, in the report of the evidence taken by the Marconi Committee, we quote Mr. Lawson,

Mr. Samuel's Latest

"Question 558 gives Sir Alexander King's account of what happened at the final meeting of the Imperial Wireless Committee on January 17. Mr. Samuel, he said, proposed to see Mr. Gandhil (of the Poulsen Company) again, and if he could not arrange certain conditions with him he 'proposed to write to Mr. Isaacs to the effect that the Committee was inclined to recommend the acceptance of his offer.'"

"Privilege"

FINALLY, Mr. Lawson pointed out to the Chairman of the Marconi Committee, "There appears in the *Financial News* of January 25 a statement made on the preceding day to a representative of that paper by Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, that 'there is every reason to believe that the signatures will be affixed within the next few days.' I leave it, Sir, to you and the members of your Committee to judge whether a statement supported by the evidence of the three principal negotiators of the Marconi Agreement—the Postmaster-General, the permanent Secretary of the Post Office, and the Managing Director of the Marconi Company—ought to be branded in the House of Commons by a Cabinet Minister as 'totally false.'" In the meantime our precious Postmaster-General had a humiliating encounter with the *Spectator*, to whom his private secretary had been directed to send a copy of his statement in the House of Commons, to which the editor added a note containing the following,

As to Mr. Samuel's guarded innuendo, we desire to ask him whether he means to suggest falsehood in the *Spectator?* If he does, let him put his accusation plainly and repeat it where it is not privileged. In that case we will at once begin proceedings for libel against him. In this way Mr. Samuel will be able to discover whether he has a right to charge us with falsehood. . . . We must add here a protest against the habit of members of Parliament of making defamatory statements in regard to newspapers under cover of parliamentary privilege. We may repeat here that we have never accused Mr. Samuel or any of his colleagues in the Cabinet of any corrupt intent in regard to the Marconi Contract, for the good and sufficient reason that we do not believe him or any of them to have had any such intent. We have, however, expressed great regret that a most unfortunate atmosphere of suspicion has been created—unfairly no doubt—in the public mind; and further we have urged that Mr. Samuel and Sir Rufus Isaacs should bring actions for libel against their traducers. Men holding offices of great public trust have on them an imperative duty to take action when they are publicly accused. This failure to prosecute is not in the least made good by suggestions of falsehood conveyed under the protection of parliamentary privilege.

A week later (November 30) Mr. Herbert Samuel, no longer through

the medium of a private secretary, but in *propria persona*, made a grovelling apology to the *Spectator*. To the question as to whether he had intended to impute falsehood to the *Spectator* Mr. Samuel sententiously replied, "It is due to you, sir, that I should answer your question and say that I had no such intention; and if I had thought my words could be held to convey the innuendo you saw in them I should have framed them differently. On the contrary, I have always had much respect for the high standard of accuracy on questions of fact which the *Spectator* combines with the advocacy of strong political opinion, and which makes it all the more necessary to take notice of errors into which it may be led when it reproduces without verification the assertions of other journals." Unfortunately for Mr. Samuel, the same issue of the *Spectator* contained a letter from Mr. Lawson including his statement to the Chairman of the Marconi Committee already referred to; and the Editor of the *Spectator*, in a foot-note to Mr. Samuel's letter, observed on the question of the alleged inaccuracy of Mr. Lawson's statement: "We must refer Mr. Samuel to Mr. Lawson's letter in our issue of to-day. It is difficult to reconcile Mr. Samuel's present statement with that made in debate in the Commons quoted in Mr. Lawson's letter to the Committee." With every week that passes Mr. Samuel's ineptitude becomes more conspicuous, and, taken in conjunction with contemporary episodes, it is safe to say that government by Samuel, Isaacs, and Montagu is scotched, if not killed.

Single Self-paid Chamber

Our "single self-paid Chamber," to borrow Mr. Rudyard Kipling's apt description of the House of Commons, declines to give the country any serious respite from its melancholy and nefarious labours. There is a corrupt contract between our Tammany Hall Government and the Molly Maguires to force through Parliament within an appointed time a Bill for the misgovernment of Ireland which both sets of conspirators know to be so rotten and unworkable, alike from the British and the Irish point of view, that they know it can never come into force. The Molly Maguires are, however, pledged to their foreign subscribers to place some measure labelled "Home Rule" on the Statute Book, while Ministers are pledged to "toe the line" to the Molly Maguires

in return for the substantial consideration set forth on a previous page in the shape of vast salaries, for the continuance of which they are exclusively indebted to Molly Maguire support. This impossible Bill has been discussed under impossible conditions, and the operations of the gag and guillotine have killed all public interest in Parliamentary proceedings. The only live question as regards the House of Commons is, "What will the Government of snobbery, jobbery, and robbery do next?" The Unionists have kept their end up wonderfully well, and have done all that is possible under the circumstances to expose the grotesque absurdities of a measure which *inter alia* establishes two separate fiscal systems in the United Kingdom, to say nothing of separate flags. Free Trade as well as federalism have both gone by the board, but sufficient restrictions remain to condemn the experiment of "Ireland a nation" to failure without a loophole for success. If any one cherishes illusions as to the real character and aims of the Nationalist movement he should read the debate on the flag on December 12, when Mr. John Redmond again came out in his true colours and for the hundredth time stands convicted as a canting hypocrite for the speeches he delivers to British simpletons, protesting his love of this country and the British Empire.

The Opposition

MR. BONAR LAW has done admirably as Leader of the Opposition, as may be gathered from the bilious and venomous attacks upon him of the Coalition Press, from *Reynolds's Newspaper* to the Mond mouthpiece. He has been splendidly backed by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Sir Edward Carson, and the Unionist rank and file, while the Whipping of the Party has been beyond praise. The Molly Maguire Bill has been forced through Committee—many vital parts undiscussed—and is expected to be shortly sent to the House of Lords. The Duke of Bedford made a noteworthy speech a few weeks ago at Luton suggesting that the Bill should be allowed to go by default through the Upper House—as its remaining powers are farcical—a proceeding that would bring the crisis to a head. We have no idea as to the official policy of the Party, but it may be thought that the Duke of Bedford's policy might be misunderstood by the electorate in the event of an election, and it is

argued in some quarters that the passing of the Home Rule Bill *ipso facto* necessitates a General Election. The Bill unquestionably means civil war whenever it is attempted to put loyal Belfast under Dublin, and it is only a question of choosing the least inconvenient date. Perhaps postponement is advisable. If only the Die Hards had won last year, either this Bill would never have come into existence or it would have been destroyed by Radical Peers. The Unionists are making a fine fight against the odious attack on the Welsh Church, and Radicals have actually dared to show some independence, with the result that the Government were compelled to make concessions, as otherwise not even the faithful Molly Maguires could have saved them from defeat. Mr. Ormsby Gore, one of the youngest and most able Unionists—who has had a singularly successful session, upon which he is entitled to many congratulations—moved an amendment to save the glebe to the Church, in which the Government had a bad division. Another group of young Unionists have made a gallant fight in a Standing Committee against the glaring injustices of the Trade Unions Bill, under which, willy-nilly, Trade Unionists are to be coerced into financing the Labour Party, which many of them, if not a majority, loathe.

THE UNITED STATES AND ANGLO-GERMAN RIVALRY

AMERICAN life is still too intense, the problems of its economic development, and the relations between the individual and the State, still too unsettled, to have fostered an interest in the nation at large, in questions of foreign policy which are no less far-reaching in their nature, because not visibly oppressive. Yet the recent vast extension in foreign trade, and the gradual industrial evolution of the country, coupled with the growth of population, causing American exports to be increasingly manufactures, and decreasingly agricultural, must inevitably bring about an augmenting attention to questions of external order. Already, within the last decade, this has become noticeable in the importance which the so-called "Open Door" in China, and the relations with Latin America have assumed before the public eye. In both instances, trade, present and future, has been the foundation and the objective of interest. The political cloak assumed, in the one case, by often repeated formulas regarding the integrity of China, in the other by the Monroe Doctrine and American sisterhood, has covered the very legitimate self-interest presented by the extension of commercial relations and the growth of the nation's influence.

Beyond this, however, watchfulness ceased. The affairs of Europe, picturesque and weighty as they appeared, yet seemed to have no immediate visible relation to the United States. In whatever direction might lie natural sympathies, the country as a whole remained unaware that its own interests were in any way concerned or affected by the future of the European problem and indifferent thereto. A traditional disinterestedness continued as potent a formula of statecraft as half a century ago, without

Americans realising that altered conditions rendered necessary a modification of this attitude, and that the vast extension of international interests and the complexity of modern life no longer permitted former isolation. While the country had consciously altered its political, strategical and economic situation in the world by the creation of new oversea interests and the industrial growth of a century, it yet cherished the illusion of being able to preserve intact diplomatic ideas that had long since served their time. The belief prevailed that since in Europe, America had no territorial interests nor ambition, it had likewise no solicitude and could with impunity remain indifferent to whatever occurred on its political plane.

A brief retrospect suggests, however, ample proof to the contrary. The European balance of power has been such a permanent factor since the birth of the republic that Americans have never realised how its absence would have affected their political status. The national existence was first brought about by European dissension. When Pitt resisted Napoleon, the justifiable irritation felt against British high-handedness at sea caused Americans to forget that England's fight was in reality their own, and that the undisputed master of Europe would not have been long in finding pretexts to reacquire the Louisiana territory which, except for England, he would never have relinquished. When the Holy Alliance endeavoured to concentrate the power of Europe under the banner of legitimacy and divine right, Canning, by inspiring the Monroe Doctrine, interposed an effective restraint in the Western Hemisphere, and in the often-quoted phrase, "called in the New World to redress the balance of the Old."

Fifty years later, had England joined France in recognising the Confederacy or in her abortive Mexican adventure, the history of the United States might have run a different course. At no time since the foundation of the Republic could a change materially altering the ancient European balance of power have been brought about without perceptibly affecting American interests and the position of the United States. Even to-day, in spite of the enormous increase in the country's resources and population, this political axiom holds as true as it did in the period of national formation and weakness. The undisputed paramountcy of any nation, both by land and sea, must inevitably

make that Power a menace and a peril to every other country. In the words of a distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Olney, were the career of a Napoleon ever again to approach or even to threaten repetition, not merely sentiment and sympathy, but the strongest consideration of self-preservation and self-defence might compel the United States to take sides. It may therefore be of interest to survey the forces of war and peace to-day at work in Europe and see if there lies any menace to that balance of power, the preservation of which is essential to its national security.

At a time when arbitration and peace movements have assumed an unprecedented importance, it is a curious commentary on the age that there should likewise be so vast an increase of armaments and military preparation. The same scepticism in abstract justice, the same belief in the possible imminence of a great conflict, the same desire on the part of every nation to be the arbiter of its own political fortunes is apparent throughout the world. A feeling of unrest, moreover, has spread over Europe, and the inflammable state of its public opinion is everywhere noticeable. The modern conception of the nation in arms, and the prolonged situation of a peace constantly more prepared for war is not the only cause for the existence of this spirit. The fresh taxation imposed by economically wasteful armaments at the same time as nations find themselves increasingly compelled to embark on extensive and expensive programmes of social reform, have contributed to augment the cost of life and the consequent dissatisfaction. There is, moreover, a growing discontent throughout Europe with the system of parliamentarism and certain results of representative Government. France, England, and Germany are all experiencing this, though for different causes and with different purposes in view. To a nation confronted by internal difficulties the diversion of an energetic foreign policy appealing to a united patriotism is always a possible alternative. That it has rarely been abused stands to the credit of European statesmanship. But in any survey of the existing situation, particularly on the Continent, it lurks in the background as a dangerous possibility.

It remains an anomaly that modern democratic government has been no more peaceful than former absolutism. Moltke's

prophecy that popular rule enhanced the likelihood of war was correct. The situation lately witnessed in the parliamentary discussion over the Moroccan agreement in both Germany and France, where the leaders of political parties were far more combative and unyielding than their Government, proved significant, though in the one instance hostility was directed against England, while in the other it was against the readiness of the French Government to compromise. The high sensitiveness of a proud people, the confidence in its own strength, and the critical and often malignant scrutiny to which every Government is now exposed from within, are all factors contributing to embitter the atmosphere of international relations by stiffening the attitude of those in power.

Various elements have thus contributed to bring about the present state of restlessness and uncertainty in Europe. Nor are other signs wanting to confirm this. Like the flight of birds before a storm, some indication of the belief in the likelihood of an impending conflict may be gathered from the recent efforts on the part of the smaller European States to preserve their neutrality and their independence in the event of the greater Powers going to war. Belgium, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, and Switzerland, have each quite recently taken stock of their position in such event, and embarked on fresh military or naval programmes to increase the national security. A wave of renewed militarism and nationalism has spread over Europe. France, where it had lain dormant for years, is now witnessing an intense revival provoked by the recent difficulties with Germany over Morocco, and excited by its splendid success in aviation. In Russia the painful awakening after the Manchurian War, has led to a reorganised Army and the construction of a new Navy. In Austria-Hungary the difficulties attending the late annexation prompted a military reform, while gratitude to Germany for the assistance rendered during that crisis, has led to an extensive battleship programme and awakened for the first time naval ambition. Italy again, whatever be the future of her newly designed African Empire, realises that she has condemned herself during many years to come to a vastly increased expenditure for armaments.

The sources of European unrest could, however, be more lightly

dismissed without the antagonism between Great Britain and Germany. In spite of the attempts made on both sides to explain it away, and to dwell on the pacific disposition animating the construction of new "Dreadnoughts," this remains as an irreducible fact obscuring the political horizon. Nor should it be regarded as a mere contest for commercial supremacy on the part of two countries, one seeking to preserve, the other to gain new markets. Intelligent Germans are the first to recognise that neither their merchants nor their trade suffer in British Colonies. Beneath it lies the deeply conscious rival ambition of two great nations, the one to maintain undiminished the heritage conquered by its forebears, the other to obtain the place "under the sun" which it regards as its right. And the magnitude of this issue is enhanced by the hardly lesser constellations gravitating around the rivals, each with its own historic traditions and interests, but who have realised comparative security in a system which finds its political expression in the series of alliances and understandings forming the balance of modern Europe.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the grave danger of the present relations between Great Britain and Germany lies in the fact that there is no real difficulty between the two Powers. Where a concrete obstacle stands in the way, by compromise and mutual goodwill it may be removed. In recent years, the Anglo-French and Anglo-Russian negotiations, by a judicious policy of give-and-take, smoothed out through diplomatic means the colonial rivalry of a century. But between Germany and England similar adjustment is impossible. Their antagonism presents nothing concrete save rival ambition. Both Powers are logical and right in their attitude. From England's point of view she is carrying out her traditional policy of wellnigh four centuries. Whether set forth by an Elizabethan Cecil or a modern Lloyd George, whether directed against a Spanish Armada, the ambition of Louis XIV., the legions of Napoleon, or the might of William II., the purpose is the same. The same causes have made her the enemy of France and Russia, and the friend of Prussia, which make her to-day the friend of Russia and France and the adversary of a united Germany seeking oversea expansion.

The position of Germany is no less logical. Having achieved her unity and imperial position by blood and iron, there is no

reason why she should abandon the element of armed force which has been the mainspring of her triumph. Patriotic Germans may differ among themselves whether an increased naval programme is advisable, but the nation is practically united with regard to the importance of maintaining her military supremacy, both by reason of an exposed central continental position and because of the unhealed wound inflicted on her Western neighbour. It is no fault of Germany if her strength is so huge that Europe trembles when she moves. Nor is she to blame if in the quest for new outlets all efforts at expansion under her own flag are thwarted by the Colonial Empires of her rivals. The unfortunate position of Germany in this respect is readily apparent, but less obvious is any peaceful remedy compatible with the interests of neutrals. The suggestion lately advanced of compensation in the Congo, or in the Portuguese Colonies, even if practicable would only be a later cause of difficulty. It might delay, but could not arrest, the growing antagonism between two great countries in their struggle for supremacy. The appetite for Colonies is fed on what it consumes, and a justifiable desire for more suitable frontiers or enlarged boundaries would be the inevitable result of such surrender. What on one side could be regarded as generosity, would on the other be interpreted as weakness, with the invitation for subsequent aggression brought about by the pressure of strength.

There is no desire herein to criticise Germany. Her action, present and prospective, is that of a great nation conscious of its force, but conscious also of the limitations of its present exercise and of having arrived too late in the field of colonial enterprise and conquest. On the side of Germany there should, however, be less irritation at the acts of other Powers desiring to preserve their own, and unwilling to diminish an Empire won by the valour and foresight of their ancestors.

Although the Anglo-German antagonism finds sources of friction in Africa, its essence is far more metropolitan than colonial, and its character psychological more than commercial. The feeling of hostile antagonism exists to-day among the English and German people to a greater extent than in their Governments. The latter realise vividly the terrific responsibility of such a conflict, the magnitude of the interests involved, the catastrophic

nature alike of victory or defeat. In the fact that neither can wish to precipitate this contest lies the surest hope for peace.

Mutual hesitations exist which must counsel prudence. The prestige of Germany and of the Hohenzollern dynasty, acquired by war but fortified by peace, is too great to risk everything in a struggle which if unsuccessful would shake the foundations of the throne. German military science has as its axiom, moreover, to embark on no war unless certain of success; while the destruction of its seagoing commerce is accepted as inevitable. France had in the past appeared to Germany as the hostage for England. But even in this, victory no longer seems as certain as before. In the eyes of experienced observers, the German Army has deteriorated in recent years, and the French has commensurately improved. Now that the latter is no longer honeycombed by dissension its still-existing superiority in artillery and its new development of aviation give it certain advantages over the greater numerical strength of Germany. For the first time also since Waterloo England is able to throw a military force of consequence on continental soil. The six British divisions of professional soldiers equipped for foreign service and ready for early mobilisation, are to-day a fact which Germany cannot fail to consider, and which should contribute toward remedying any inferiority in men from which France would suffer. The fields of Belgium may again witness a struggle where the descendants of Napoleon and Wellington's men will this time stand side by side against Blücher's.

If the uncertainty of victory on land as on sea thus imposes a restraint on the German warlike spirit, the tremendous consequences of a conflict likewise speaks for prudence in Great Britain. The peril of a contest which would be a matter of life and death to her, the terrific sacrifices entailed even in the event of victory, the risk of starvation at home in case of disasters at sea, the possibility of invasion, the destruction of the Empire if defeated, are all nightmares to appal the most venturesome statesman.

There is little danger that conscious of these grave responsibilities any German or British Government would do ought to precipitate a conflict of such gigantic proportions however favourable the moment might appear. But there is serious danger lest in an atmosphere as surcharged as is the present, with the

deep-rooted feeling of hostility existing on both sides, some petty cause of friction, or some paltry colonial quarrel, inflaming public opinion, should induce either Government to prefer a foreign contest which it might regard as inevitable to domestic humiliation. The explosion provoked by the so-called Agadir incident, which brought three nations to the verge of war for a few square miles of Moroccan sand, is significant of the intensity of feeling aroused, and of the pregnancy of danger. Future war or peace is to-day in the hands of the English and German people far more than in that of their Governments. The decision rests with them not to goad the latter into assuming positions or advancing pretensions from which honourable retreat will have become impossible.

Whatever be the future of this situation a far-sighted statesmanship compels the United States, as it does every other nation, to take cognisance of the possibility of a conflict breaking out in the near future between Great Britain and Germany, and to consider in what manner its interests would be affected. It is an easy remedy to repeat the old adage about American proverbial non-interference in European affairs. With all respect toward a policy which in the past has been thoroughly sound, it cannot be said in this instance to offer a complete panacea. A struggle between the two nations, even though it did not set ablaze the rest of Europe, cannot leave America indifferent. In too many regions of the world would its interests be affected by such reality.

It would withal be absurd to deduce from this, that the United States would be dragged into a war against all inclination. The alternative of arms is no necessary consequence of diplomatic interest, and in such a conflict direct participation would with proper precautions be most unlikely. This should not, however, excuse any neglect on the part of Americans to consider the various political, strategic, and economic points of view in different regions of the world, where such struggle would react upon them, or how the balance of power, which it should be the policy of the United States to preserve in Europe, would be affected by the contest. An indication of its wide-reaching nature independent of the actual field of hostilities, would, for instance, be presented in the Far East, where the even temporary withdrawal of European influence would leave America face

to face with a commensurately more powerful Japan. To say nothing of the Philippines the situation thus created depends on the degree of stability and strength attained by China. It is not difficult, however, to conceive of circumstances where to ensure respect for the often pledged integrity of that State would lead the United States toward a course of action which it would be obliged to adopt single-handed, and without the benefit of such diplomatic support as in the past it has received from friendly Powers.

Omitting from consideration the extent to which the almost inevitable conflagration would affect the world in a conflict between Great Britain and Germany, three general possibilities are open: (1) The victory of the former; (2) The reverse; (3) A war of indefinite result.

So far as America is concerned, the first alternative would be the least likely to materially alter the existing status. England might conceivably recover a pecuniary indemnity and deal a death-blow to German oversea commerce. But the German Colonies are not such as to sensibly attract a conqueror, nor would a change in their title affect other nations in any way. While the predominant position of Germany upon the European Continent would be shattered, the balance of power would hardly be affected, even though the disposition of its weight were altered. The insular position of Great Britain debars her from continental ambitions, and any attempt to assert herself in such manner would both run counter to all her traditions and be stoutly resisted by former allied States. It is fortunate that in modern times no nation has succeeded in being paramount on both land and sea. Great Britain has hitherto refrained from unduly developing her military strength and there is no reason to anticipate that flushed by victory she would adopt a different course. Her naval superiority, which is a matter of life and death, menaces no one though it bars the way to Germany already supreme on land. But for America it represents an essential element in the maintenance and stability of the European balance of power.

If the terms of peace after such a war were to be dictated in London, the situation as it affected the United States would be radically reversed. While defeat for Germany might prove disastrous to the dynasty, for Great Britain it would be fatal to the

Empire whose disintegration would almost inevitably ensue. It is apparent that the fate of Canada and the British possessions in America immediately concern the Republic. Of Canadian loyalty to the Empire there is here no question. It is certain that like the other self-governing British Colonies, she would to the best of her ability support the Mother Country. But if the fortune of war prove adverse, there is no reason to suppose that Canada would long continue under the control, however nominal, of a parent State deprived of prestige and authority, and ruined by an unsuccessful war.

Nor is it necessary to proceed so far. The active participation of Canada in such conflict would by its very nature invite reprisals. If after a series of disasters Great Britain should be crushed and her fleet destroyed or captured, Canada could not by herself stand up against an all-powerful enemy, and the fate of the Crown Colonies would be even more immediate. A strong appeal would in all likelihood be made for American protection, which could hardly fail to awaken generous response. The consequence of any such action on the part of the United States is apparent, reinforced, moreover, by an alternative which in contradiction to the Monroe Doctrine would ask it to countenance a transfer of sovereignty upon the American Continent for the benefit of a European Power hitherto deprived of such possession.

Without going to the length of such extreme conclusions, a third and more likely possibility would be that of a contest long drawn out between the two countries wherein neither could obtain decisive advantage. In spite of the paper proof that a lengthy war presents to-day an economic impossibility there is no practical evidence to substantiate this theory and there are distinguished economists who believe that the modern system of credit is peculiarly adopted to facilitate the prolongation of war. When poor countries, like Japan and Russia, have been able to maintain in the field for a considerable duration armies of almost unprecedented size, there is no reason to suppose that the pinch of poverty alone would materially hasten the conclusion of a contest between England and Germany. The financial aspect of this is also likely to concern America. If the struggle should be protracted, extensive borrowing will have to be undertaken, and New York is more and more becoming one of the money

markets of the world. It is probable that it will be called upon, possibly by both sides, to furnish pecuniary assistance, even though the obligations of strict neutrality are somewhat questionable on this point.

The extended duration of the war may be expected from the policy Germany would presumably adopt in attempting to tire out the vigilance of a British blockading fleet by long continued inaction, while perhaps striking isolated blows in distant waters. The recent construction in Germany of large battle cruisers capable of holding the seas, points to the inference that in the event of war hostilities would not remain confined to the vicinity of home ports. It would not be impossible if, as in the eighteenth century, sea fights might again take place in American waters. The capture of one of the Lesser Antilles from the English or French might offer to the Germans both a convenient haven and a pledge for subsequent negotiations. The attitude of the United States in this event would be one of no little difficulty. Logically, a policy of strict neutrality should cause it to remain, if not indifferent at least passive, but it is questionable if any American Government could long tolerate the embarrassment caused by the extended continuance of hostilities in near waters, even though it led to no more regrettable nor permanent result.

If this remains a remote though possible contingency it is otherwise with the effect of a great struggle upon economic interests. As all industry in the belligerent nations would be brought to a virtual standstill it is likely that while American manufactured exports in Europe suffered there would be a greatly increased demand for food-stuffs as well as for whatever might be of utility in the conduct of war. Such commercial losses as would be experienced in Europe could be more than counterbalanced by the opportunity presented elsewhere to acquire new markets and supplant former rivals. This would give an unwonted impetus to trade. American commerce should find before it in Latin America, South Africa, Australia, and the Far East, new outlets and new opportunities as the consequence of such a struggle.

Without a merchant marine under the American flag no adequate benefit would be derived from this situation. The export of American products would be rendered increasingly

difficult by the few remaining neutral bottoms with the consequent increase in freight rates. The creation of an American Merchant Navy thus becomes a primary necessity whether affected by postal subventions, direct subsidies, or the admission of foreign-built ships. The sad anomaly of the present position in this respect can hardly be overstated, and until steps are taken to remedy the deficiency of existing navigation laws, all efforts to win new markets will be severely handicapped. Pride is often the forerunner of real interest, and while it is only the former that suffers to-day by the absence of the American flag on the high seas, a European war, with its wide ramifications and consequences, would soon awaken the United States to realising the shortcomings of its present policy. Unless remedy be found for existing conditions it is not difficult to picture American factories and workmen reduced to idleness because a foreign war had brought about a virtual cessation of ocean transport.

Even more important than the creation of an American merchant marine is that at a time of uncertainty like the present, with the future still befogged, no efforts be spared to maintain its relative naval strength. Already the United States has fallen from the second place which, for a decade, it had occupied, and without greater exertion is likely to sink still further in the scale. The decision of Congress to curtail the programme of naval construction could not have been less auspiciously chosen in its moment. To desist from a normal development, which hardly aims to do more than replace timeworn unities when all the nations of the world, great and small, are arming, is to court a disaster and to lay the country open to the consequences of such imprudence. The apostles of any one-sided disarmament at a time like the present are blindly working to expose their land to a disgraceful war or a yet more disgraceful humiliation.

In the event of a European conflagration the American fleet, even if maintained at its present relative strength, might find difficulty in accomplishing its double task of preserving the *status quo* in the Far East, and enforcing the neutrality of the Caribbean, where the presence of hostilities would certainly embarrass and possibly endanger American interests. The preservation of the *Pax Americana* as a corollary to the Monroe Doctrine should be

its goal at all times. The United States has everything to gain by the peaceful and orderly evolution of existing conditions on the Western Hemisphere and nothing by sudden or violent changes, even where its interests do not appear to be immediately affected. Hence any attempt to make of American waters the scene of war would be extremely distasteful to its policy.

The question of neutrality of the Caribbean might even be broached by diplomatic channels in time of peace. To Great Britain and France it would in all likelihood be welcome, as ridding them of solicitude in respect to islands difficult of defence, and where their sole ambition is to maintain but not to extend. Nor could Germany, possessing no territorial interests in such waters, avow pretensions which would place her in opposition to this view. An international agreement having this in sight would thus contribute toward guaranteeing a stability of present possession by keeping the peace in the event of a European conflict and removing the likelihood of possible future changes of title embarrassing to the strategic and political position the United States occupy there. The alternative of a German victory, with the acquisition of a base of operations or even of territorial advantages, close to Central America, where Germans already possess great interests, and commanding the approaches to Panama, could not leave the Republic indifferent to the future of such prospect.

An Anglo-German conflict would thus affect the United States at various points and in various ways. There is hardly a branch of American national activity, governmental or economic, which would not feel its consequences in varying degree or be concerned by its outcome. While the American attitude in such contest would in the beginning be one of strict neutrality, which would be maintained as long as possible, this does not mean that a far-sighted policy might not under certain contingencies impose a different course of action. However considerable the responsibility incurred, however great the bait offered, it would hardly be wise statesmanship to remain passive if England should by any series of disasters be crushed. Even though the immediate consequence would be to throw Canada and the British Antilles into the lap of the United States, it would leave the latter confronted by an Empire supreme on land and sea, and would force it to pursue a preparation of armaments

which for its own preservation would not be inferior to what it might be called upon to face. Unperceived by many Americans, the European balance of power is a political necessity which can alone sanction on the Western Hemisphere the continuance of an economic development unhandicapped by the burden of extensive armaments. At no time, even unknown to the United States, were European politics a matter of indifference to its vital interests. But if hitherto it was impotent to alter their march, a fortunate destiny preserved the existing balance.

Seeking, as little as in the past, any selfish benefit in the Old World, even though it were possible, America has to-day a distinct and legitimate duty in the family of great nations in contributing to preserve those elements which compose the balance of power, and to which it can only be blind at a later cost. The disappearance or diminution of any one State in Europe would be a calamity, varying with its degree. But while the importance of such extinction might not in most instances be sufficiently close to warrant or provoke active intervention, this would not be true with Great Britain. The disintegration of the British Empire would be a defeat for America by the erection of a Power supreme on land and sea. A German historian of reputation, Professor Oncken, of Heidelberg, has lately, with reason, expounded the view that in 1864 in the war over the Duchies, England was unconsciously defeated. "Had Schleswig-Holstein remained Danish, the right bank of the Elbe up to the gates of Hamburg not been German territory, and the Canal from the Baltic to the North Sea an impossibility, all the conditions of Germany's maritime position would have been non-existent." French historians have similarly traced the beginnings of their disasters in 1870 to their non-interference in the affair of the Duchies. The lesson of how a failure to act later reacts should not be lost.

To consider the possible contingency of such intervention by the United States as tantamount to an alliance with Great Britain would be untrue. Where there is no treaty there is no alliance. America does not keep England from war nor push her toward a conflict. In the event of hostilities the assertion of its neutrality would at once be made and strictly lived up to. If Germany and England choose to indulge in the luxury of war such is their right. However much

one may lament the loss of life, it is no affair of the United States even though England were defeated, so long as the general balance is preserved. But if ever decisive results are about to be registered of a nature calculated to upset what has for centuries been the recognised political fabric of Europe, America can remain indifferent thereto only at her own eventual cost. If it then neglects to observe that the interests of the nations crushed are likewise its own, America will be guilty of political blindness which it will later rue. To guard against this danger the diplomatic rôle of the United States in Europe should be far more active than in the past. Properly understood and carried out by skilful agents it would be one which instead of being resented should entitle it to the gratitude of all lovers of peace, since it would be apparent that without selfish designs of its own it aimed to preserve the rights of all.

It is mistaking the nature of diplomacy to think that this would involve America in entanglements wherein it had no concern. But it is likewise mistaking its scope for national utility to accord by an attitude of indifferent passivity a free field to the forceful ambition of any single State. Great Britain, by upholding the European balance of power, has contributed toward American development. If misfortune in arms await her it would be as politically unwise as it would be ungenerous to allow her to suffer unduly. A disastrous defeat inflicted by an opponent unwilling to use moderation in his victory should invite on the part of America a friendly mediation which in the last extremity might have to be converted into more effective measures. Hence the advisability for the United States of preserving its strength in such a way as ever to make its counsel welcome and its action unnecessary.

WASHINGTON.

THE PRESENT ASPECT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

We are at the present time passing through a critical stage with regard to the question of national defence. A comic interlude has been provided by two speeches from Lord Haldane and Colonel Seely. The one delivered a short lecture on strategy, a knowledge of which according to him was frequently denied to those who, like Lord Roberts, had only commanded troops in the field. It is evident, therefore, that we must revise our estimate of Alexander the Great, Hannibal, Julius Cæsar, Marlborough, Frederick the Great, and Wellington, because none of those leaders ever commanded so large an army as Lord Roberts in South Africa. This strategy from the Woolsack was shortly followed by a speech from Colonel Seely in which he deprecated the attempt to draw lessons from the Balkan war unfavourable to our own military forces. He had been told by an eyewitness of the campaign that the Turkish defeats were due to the adoption of a system alien to Turkish traditions. He never mentioned other factors such as an excessive proportion of reservists in the ranks, untrained and undisciplined reserves, generals without experience in the manipulation of large bodies of men, insufficiency of trained horses and a transport never exercised in supplying even one division in peace time, not to mention political intrigue in the promotion of officers and inducements to such officers to advertise a system fulfilling no military requirement—all these it was of course wiser to ignore. The assumption that universal service is alien to British traditions is of course due to a wilful ignorance of history. Lord Bacon stated that it was the only guarantee of national security. But that was in the days before there was any "clear-thinking." A system by

which the army of every Continental state becomes the outward and visible sign of the national spirit, the embodiment of national ideals, in which every citizen by the very nature of the service can take a personal interest and pride, was then compared by Colonel Seely to the system by which the pressgang in 1811 used to kidnap British citizens in the dead of night, and throw them gagged and bound on to vessels preparing for sea! This is eminently worthy of a gentleman who ten years ago proclaimed himself strongly in favour of national service, a few years later said that the British people would never submit to it until they had had a disaster, and now says that he wants "voluntary national service or universal service by consent."

Comment is needless. There is a comic side certainly to all this, but our ancestors would have called it treason. We can be content to leave history to pronounce upon it, and there is little doubt that she will place these gentlemen high upon her pillory of shame by the side of the Sackvilles, the Dundases, the Lebœufs, the Oliviers, the Alexieffs, and all those who through weakness, ignorance, or folly have betrayed their country.

It is important to understand the present situation. Through all the futility of Lord Haldane's speech there runs that vein of cunning which compels one to take him seriously—a task which his successor never imposes. The keynote of the former's speech was the antagonism which, he asserted, existed between the National Service League and those he was pleased to term the "scientific" soldiers. Both, according to him, while differing from one another, took a one-sided view of the situation and ignored the conditions of sea-power. This last statement was refuted by Sir J. French a short time ago. The General Staff and the Naval War Staff are working in absolute harmony, and presumably the Naval War Staff do not ignore the conditions of sea-power. Their views on the situation are identical. Therefore both the scientific soldiers and sailors are, according to Lord Haldane, wrong. This is also the view of the *Westminster Gazette*. It expressly warns us against adopting the view of the professional strategists. Now the problem, it may be admitted, is not entirely a naval and military one, inasmuch as statesmanship has to reconcile naval and military requirements with what is politically possible; it is therefore a politico-strategical problem.

But what the Government are doing is to ignore altogether the view of the strategist and to consider only what is politically convenient to the Liberal party at the present moment. It is exactly as if a sick man were to call in the doctor, listen to his diagnosis and then dismiss him with the remark that his view was a one-sided one.

There is, however, a darker side to the matter. The voluntary system has broken down completely. Lord Haldane knows it. He knows too that the Government are leaving their successors the alternative of either bolstering up this sham or embarking on a system of universal service. The slightest move in this direction will, however, be greeted with the cry of "conscription."

Properly worked such a cry might turn an election. The opportunity is too good to be missed. The Government have no suggestion, no remedy to replace this abject failure, the Territorial scheme. Yet if the Unionists suggest any remedy, they will do it at their peril. The motto of the Government is "*Après moi le déluge*," and in all the history of party strife no dirtier game has ever been played.

It is well to be warned in time. That is the first danger. The second has already been referred to. An endeavour will be made to sow dissension between the National Service League and the so-called "scientific" soldiers. Now this matter should be clearly understood. The first requirement of strategy, given the present international situation, is to be in a position to despatch such a reinforcement to the Continent within the first fortnight of war as to counterbalance the German superiority over France. Home defence is a secondary requirement and is in fact fulfilled by the carrying out of this first requirement. There is much misunderstanding on this subject. It is commonly supposed, for instance, that a Continental national army exists solely for the defence of its native land. In a sense this is true. The German or French soldier would certainly say that his primary duty was the defence of the Fatherland. But a moment's consideration must convince any one that this phrase has a different meaning for the German or the Frenchman than it has for the Englishman. For the former knows that his first duty on the outbreak of war is to invade the territory of his neighbour.

His eye is fixed on Paris or Berlin as the case may be. To the average Englishman the defence of his native land means a desperate resistance to a German landing, or, failing that, a hard-fought battle on the North Downs. Now strategy has nothing to do with passive defence—it is a purely negative thing. Strategy is the means of gaining a decisive victory, and a decisive victory is the only means of defending one's country. The German or Frenchman knows that he will only gain that object on the road to Paris or Berlin. His conception is strategically correct. The Englishman's is strategically wrong, because his conception of the defence of his native land can only achieve a negative object. It can never give him decisive victory.

Judged by this standard it is evident that the raising of a large army for home defence only is strategically wrong. Hence the criticisms of the National Service League by those whom Lord Haldane calls the "scientific" soldiers.

Now the question is this. Is it possible to instil the correct conception of national defence into the British public? It should be noted that there is no essential difference in the situation as it confronts a Continental power and as it confronts ourselves. It is often said, "No nation has ever adopted compulsory service except from fear of invasion." This is probably true. But invasion is only probable in the event of the break-up of the *Entente* with France either through diplomatic action or through the defeat of France. It can only be averted, therefore, by guaranteeing help to France on land. But apart from this, invasion can only be averted as other nations avert it, by attacking your enemy and carrying the war into his country. Nor does the sea make any difference. If a land campaign is the only means of averting invasion there can be no difference between crossing the Channel and crossing the Vosges mountains. The Channel is merely a frontier barrier just as a mountain range, a river, or a desert may be. To regard it merely as an obstacle is a strategical heresy. Such frontiers should be used as a screen to conceal one's movements and to render the offensive easier and more unexpected. As a matter of fact this was the use we made of our "narrow seas" in the past. Again it is surely an act of folly to raise armies for home defence only, whereby at the most a negative object only can be obtained and

which involves the devastation of your own land, when you might achieve victory with a far smaller sacrifice in a foreign land!

Lord Haldane of course will make capital out of these apparently irreconcilable ideas. It is essential, therefore, that all those who care for their country should be united on this subject, and as a matter of fact there is nothing irreconcilable in the two conceptions.

No thinking person can doubt that we need a very much larger army for service abroad as well as a force capable of undertaking immediately the defence of these shores in the absence of the Regular Army. If the British people are so blind that they cannot regard the problem as a foreigner regards it and that compulsion can only be adopted for home service, it must be so. But it is impossible to believe that if all those whose duty it is to enlighten the electorate could themselves understand and explain the problem to others, that then the people would not themselves realise the necessity. The Opposition are, however, placed in an exceedingly difficult position, and indeed it is hard to see how any form of national service can be adopted except by a combination of parties for this object. This result may not be as far off as some suppose. For the time being, however, we must avoid playing into the hands of Lord Haldane.

It is the duty of every patriotic man to support Lord Roberts and his League. This can be done without ignoring the prior claim of a striking force for foreign service to a home defence one. If compulsion be instituted for home defence, there can be no doubt that a large striking force could be obtained by volunteers from the home defence force transferring into the striking force for higher rates of pay, the term of service for this force being two years as on the Continent. It would certainly seem desirable for the National Service League to extend their period of four months training to a year, and this may perhaps be done. It is often asserted by Lord Haldane and others that it is impossible to combine a system of voluntary service for oversea purposes with one of compulsory service for home defence. This is refuted by the example of France. That country maintains in her colonies a white force, numbering about two thirds of our overseas garrisons exclusive of natives, as well as a first line

army of considerably over a million at war strength with perhaps another two millions in reserve, whereas ours numbers only 150,000 men with no reserves worth the name after all our obligations are reckoned with.

And she does all this for a sum less by nine millions than the total we spend on our military forces! As to the supposed difficulty of inducing men to transfer from a compulsory home army into either a voluntary long-service colonial army or into a voluntary short-service striking force, surely an unanswerable proof to the contrary lies in the fact that both the militia and the Special Reserve have formed the main recruiting area for the Line for years past. Can it really be imagined that men receiving very low rates of pay would refuse a far higher rate for colonial service, or still more would refuse such a rate merely because it involved a slightly longer period of service and the bare possibility of foreign service on the Continent?

It is most important that we should have clear aims in the present crisis. None could demand a better leader than Lord Roberts. If the principle of the National Service League be once adopted, the game is won. However dark the situation, however gross the folly and wickedness of those who are humiliating the nation, the truth must prevail if the advocates of national service remain united under one banner.

PERCY.

THE NEW CRUSADER

We now know on the authority of his newspaper henchmen that towards the close of the present month Mr. Lloyd George will open his land crusade. His speech at Aberdeen last month gives a lively foretaste of what is to come. Mr. Lloyd George's numerous failures in the past and the rich crop of scandals in Liberal administration are to be obscured by a deluge of falsehoods and a storm of Limehouse abuse. There must be some cry to counteract the universal loathing of the National Insurance Act, and various Semitic scandals. Home Rule is no good; Welsh Disestablishment is regarded by the voter as a particularly mean—and unprofitable—theft. The licensed trade has been so plundered that it no longer offers any prospect of loot, and, moreover, the average elector likes his glass of beer. An indiscriminate foray against the wealthy and the plutocrats is not to be thought of because a multitude of millionaires and plutocrats finances the Radical Party. Some device must be found for sparing the Quakers of the cocoa trade, the rich soap-boilers, the prosperous alkali potentates, the alien financiers, and the Hebrew brokers. So Mr. Lloyd George is driven back on the land. If he offers his followers the spoil of the landlords, he will not unduly alarm the Radical plutocrats. And as the word "landlord" has two meanings in English, the mobs before which he rants and raves will go home convinced that he intends to give them not only soil but houses—that his real object is to make every man's dwelling his own and everybody rich at somebody else's expense.

As even the burglar usually professes that in "cracking a crib" he is actuated by high moral aims, so Mr. Lloyd George must protest *ad nauseam* the noblest moral intentions in breaking the Eighth Commandment. He is going to give everybody "a place in the sun"—to create a new heaven on earth. To provide

himself with plausible excuses for his purposed robbery, he has set up the secret Land Inquiry, carried out by "stray jackals" and spies. This committee of his myrmidons has as its real province to collect a copious supply of serviceable lies authenticated by prejudiced partisans. The "facts" thus obtained will be about as trustworthy as were Mr. Lloyd George's statements concerning the Gorringe case, the Wallbottle affair, or "the little tailor's shop at Cardiff." But this does not trouble Mr. Lloyd George. That he is perfectly aware of the absence of all real case against the landowner is proved by his refusal to permit the people he is attacking to be heard in their own defence or to be represented on the tribunal which is to condemn them. That he is responsible for the tactics of this un-English committee there can be no possible doubt. In an incautious moment, Lord Haldane admitted it in the House of Lords, and Mr. Asquith's denial of it in the House of Commons was as unconvincing as his denials usually are. It suits the Prime Minister to shut his eyes. He will profit by Mr. Lloyd George's guile should the campaign prove a success, or repudiate it, if it issues in ridicule and failure.

But though Mr. Asquith may shut his eyes to his subordinate's proceedings, the public has a right to ask who is this politician that makes the unverified reports of "area sneaks" the basis of his "constructive proposals," and personal abuse the staple of his oratory. It may reasonably investigate Mr. Lloyd George's own character and record before taking him at his own valuation as a "crusader" and a judge of morals in Israel. Is he disinterested, is he faithful to his own professions, does his past afford the faintest justification for the claims which he advances? How would his reputation fare before such a secret Inquiry as he has set up for his victims, or indeed before an open inquiry?

As for his disinterestedness, we have the evidence of the authoritative biography which has just been published. It is a tremendous work, compiled, not by a wicked Unionist but by a devout Radical, Mr. Du Parcq, from Mr. George's early letters and diaries. We can well believe that Mr. George may be annoyed at its appearance. For it gives perhaps the most perfect revelation extant of the growth and development of that unlovely creature, the professional politician. It shows us a young man "on the make," always asking, not whether a course is right,

but whether it will pay, and trading on every petty and provincial instinct in the people among whom he lived in order that he might climb to prosperity and power. Other young men have doubtless ground their own axes with extreme vigour and prosecuted the art of getting on, but they have not usually claimed to be saints and heroes on that account. Nor can we recollect any record of the youth of self-made men that shows such a total absence of the qualities of generosity and gratitude. In the little Lloyd George, the milk of human kindness seems to have turned to venom and gall.

He was more than a political neophyte when the South African War tested his ability as a statesman. Some Liberals have bidden us admire him for his "moral courage" in protesting against that conflict. If he had protested in an honest and honourable manner, if there had not been indications that he believed the side which he espoused to be the popular and highly profitable one, we might have admired. But there was no villainy which he did not impute to his political opponents. His charges against Mr. Chamberlain were outrageous in their rancour and injustice. The British Army in the field was slandered; the enemy was encouraged to resist; and all that Mr. Lloyd George might obtain office. While the English peers and country gentry, whom Mr. Lloyd George is now marking down for insult and proscription, were fighting for their country in the field, their critic was escaping disguised as a policeman from an angry Birmingham crowd. There was not much of "the just and upright man who confronts unshaken the menaces of the wicked" in this. We await Mr. Du Parcq's comments on the episode in his next volume with intense interest.

A Welsh chapel deacon once introduced Mr. Lloyd George to a political audience with this incomparable remark: "In my opinion, gentlemen, that Bishop of St. Asaphs is one of the biggest liars in creashon; but, thank God—yes, thank God—we haff a match for him to-night." And no one who studies the Chancellor of the Exchequer's election speeches will be inclined to disagree with the worthy deacon. It was he who, when the fuglemen of his party invented the Chinese "slavery" lie, talked to ignorant Welshmen of "slavery on the hills of Wales," and suggested to them that Mr. Chamberlain was about to introduce manacled

Chinese into the Carnarvon wilds. He won the election of January 1910, by telling the unlettered of this country that under Protection the German people lived on "offal and black bread," and pretending to them that Tariff Reform would mean a diet of horse-flesh or dog's-flesh, and garbage "that would kill a tramp" for the English people. Of such falsehoods his orations throughout the Budget campaign were composed. They appealed to the worst passions in his followers. Their aim was to kindle class-hatred and to divide the nation into two warring factions, though the true statesman is he who seeks to compose the animosities ever latent between rich and poor. At the close of the campaign he was compared by one ecstatic admirer with Lincoln. But from Lincoln to Limehouse is a long step. Lincoln, it is true, was guilty of some unfortunate lapses from good taste in the earlier passages of his life. This is the only resemblance. But these lapses became rarer and rarer as his character developed. On the other hand, Mr. Lloyd George's lapses from good taste multiply as his years advance. Lincoln's nature was refined with responsibility and office. Mr. Lloyd George's grows more unscrupulous and reckless as he progresses. In all Lincoln's speeches we may search in vain for a harsh or unjust word against the South. In Mr. Lloyd George's utterances it would be futile to look for a single just or generous reference to his opponents. Lincoln in his acts and life was true to his words and faithful to the ideals which he preached. Mr. Lloyd George's acts and life are so totally at variance with his speeches and precepts that he seems the modern incarnation of Mr. Pecksniff.

The Baptist and man of peace is the preacher of class war. The worshipper in the conventicle is the author of the "offal and black bread" lie. The man who delivered the Mansion House speech, asserting the determination of Britain to defend her honour, is the Minister who, with the complicity of *the* Windbag stints the British Navy, and with the help of Colonel Seely (a second Windbag) is preparing to cut down the artillery of the British Army in a critical hour. The sentimentalist who wept pints over the hard lot of the widow and orphan is the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who refused adequate pensions to the families of the seamen dead in the nation's service. The politician who is always holding the "rich" up to odium and has shown that

with a proper distribution of wealth none should have more than £200 a year, proves his sincerity by taking twice that amount from the nation's pocket for each member of the House of Commons, to purchase a subservient majority and thus assure perennial office for himself and a perennial salary of £5000 a year. The friend of the poor, so far as can be ascertained, spends his £5000 mainly on himself. Though the Radical Plutocracy Enquiry will doubtless investigate the matter, there is nothing to show that he gives generously, or indeed at all, of his substance to charity. The Llanystymdwy Institute, as all know, represented the proceeds of a successful libel action.

In any case there are abundant signs that Mr. Lloyd George is increasing in affluence and is now to be counted among the Radical Plutocrats! His son has entered the same immensely wealthy and prosperous firm as the ex-Master of Elibank. The Chancellor of the Exchequer drives in the luxurious motor-car that is affected by the wicked "rich." He plays golf and sacrifices peasants to sport and "blooms" to balls like the veriest lord. He is building houses on such a scale that he will soon be as well provided with seats as any duke. He is not content with his handsome official residence in Downing Street. One stately abode has arisen at Criccieth that he may take the sea-air in this village which his presence renders illustrious. Another pleasure-house is being completed at Walton Heath, that he may indulge his proclivities for the noble and ancient game. The trade of demagogue must indeed be profitable. And with all these houses and with all this money, how dare he face the poor? "To-day," he said at Cardiff in December 1911, "we have greater poverty in the aggregate than we ever had; there is more severe economic bondage. . . . There are millions of men, women and children in this the richest country in the world, who through no fault of their own, go through life sodden in poverty, wretchedness and despair." Yet Mr. Lloyd George still callously continues to draw £4800 a year, to which by his own figures he has no right, and instead of spending it in alleviating this "poverty, wretchedness and despair," spends it in building seats for himself. Thus is cant justified of her pet child.

The obligation upon him is the greater because no one who carefully examines the facts can doubt that for some very con-

siderable part of this poverty and distress his own freak finance and his own legislation are responsible. It is due to him and his fatal war upon capital that wages in this country have remained stationary for the last decade, whereas in every foreign country they have risen. His refusal to protect the work of the people has driven and is still driving more than 200,000 British citizens to emigrate each year, whereas in protected Germany the average efflux is only 26,000. If he had anything of the temper of a Lincoln, he would look aghast upon such handiwork.

But, if for millions his saturnalia of power has meant heavy loss and growing poverty or exile, there are a few to whom it has brought enormous profit. What would Mr. Lloyd George have said of the Marconi Agreement had he been in Opposition and not one of the persons virtually indicted? He would have asked why the Government gave the brother of its Attorney-General a contract which was so immensely profitable that the shares of his company quadrupled in price. He would have wanted to know what members of the Government had participated in the spoil. He would have used the admission of one Post Office official, that he had bought Marconi shares and then sold out at a profit, as proof that speculation in the shares was prevalent in official and political quarters. He would have denounced the coyness of the Committee in investigating the question whether members of the Government and their friends had bought and sold shares in their own names or in the names of nominees. In truth, we are crediting him with a very sober and restrained attitude. Yet, being in office himself and a member of the Government which this affair had directly affected, when he was asked by "my friend Lansbury" a perfectly plain and fair question, whether he had personally had any dealing in the shares, he flew off at a tangent in a storm of abuse, soundly rated his "friend," and forgot to answer the "friend's" plain question.

But it is not only a question of officials' dealings in the shares. There is the question of "unearned increment" which might be raided for the poor and poverty-stricken. Mr. Lloyd George adduces as one justification for his attack on the land, that it is subject to "unearned increment" in value, "socially created" by no virtue of its proprietor. Now if ever there was

a case of "socially created unearned increment," it was in these shares of the Marconi Company, which owe their sudden inflation in value to the Government's ineptitude—to put it mildly. The capital of that company was £750,000 in shares of £1. In August 1911, when Mr. Isaacs opened his fortunate negotiations with the Government, these £1 shares of the company stood at £2. In December, when it was known to a few that the Government would close with Mr. Isaacs, they went to £3, and then they soared week by week till in April they reached £9 10*s*. If it be assumed that the clever and well-informed insiders held only half of the shares, and that they bought at £2 and sold at £6, this is the result:

375,000 shares sold at £6	£2,250,000
375,000 shares bought at £2	750,000
Unearned increment*	1,500,000

Here is a sum thirty times what Mr. Lloyd George's land taxes yield annually—a profit stimulated by Ministers from which the nation makes no gain. What could be fairer than to take this unearned increment, or at any rate half of it, for the benefit of the poor from the wealthy gentry who have calmly put it into their pockets? Who these gentry were, Mr. Lloyd George can easily discover if only he will set his spies and backstairs agents to work. And by taxing their ill-gotten gains he would deal no blow to any industry except that of frenzied finance. No one except the speculator would be one penny the worse.

A candid Socialist who had in the past the privilege of knowing Mr. George and who has watched him at his work, describes him as "the most unscrupulous and treacherous political adventurer that has been seen in our time." For once this Socialist was not far wrong. This, then, is the man who is setting out to "crusade," and to sow our England with the tares of envy and hate.

X. X. X.

AD MEMORIAM

"JONES OF NEVADA"

THERE died last month at his beautiful Santa Monica home in Southern California one of the most romantic characters in all the public life of our time.

John Percival Jones was born in Hereford about 1826. What I can put on record of this wonderful rolling stone is only the memory I retain of innumerable conversations dating back nearly five-and-thirty years. My old friend was really a shy and unobtrusive personality, studious, thoughtful, and romantic, as one is likely to be who had lived in his own words "much alone in the mountains with his Maker." I often begged him to leave some literary fragment of a life so really historic when we recall its immense span, from the marches of Wales to California, from the ministry of Liverpool to the Presidency of Taft. It is possible that some member of his charming family or his attached secretary, Mr. Eugene Davis, may have in store for the world a book of surpassing interest; but for the present sketch I must rely altogether on a memory which he impressed, perhaps, more than any man I encountered on all my tramps abroad.

I heard Senator Jones once reply to an English friend who said, "When shall I dine with you in the White House?"—"Alas, never! The dearest wish of the great American nation is thwarted, for I was born in England. But the caste exclusiveness of you English was so repellent, that when I was five months old I decided to emigrate, and I took all my family with me." Behold them then a little later, father, mother, and at least three sons, on a farm somewhere on the south shore of Lake Ontario. There, John being at the time about twenty, the report of the great gold discoveries in California reached the

family of Jones. The brothers built a small ship with their own hands, and with the help of a single sailor navigated her down the Lakes to the open sea and round the Horn to California, arriving safely in 1849. With them on this vast excursion went a party of ladies from an adjacent farm: Mrs. Murphy and two daughters. "Miss Maria was my dear friend and companion all those days. On our way we looked in upon the gay world of Rio; but when I threw myself into the mountains, a gold-seeker, I saw her no more. There were no posts in those days, the vast West soon obliterated all traces." Jones made a reasonable fortune in the mines, and in 1872 was elected by the new State of Nevada to the Senate at Washington. Being in San Francisco, Sharon, Senator-elect for California, asked Jones to dine. "I arrived," he said, "to discover in my hostess, Mrs. Sharon—Miss Maria Murphy. I took her in to dinner. We talked politics, the causes of the recent war; we talked mines and vineyards and the beauty of Mount Shasta, but not a word about our journey from Lake Ontario round the Horn. As she got up from dinner Mrs. Sharon said, 'Senator Jones, you have forgotten me!' 'No, Miss Maria,' I said, 'but I thought it was for you to speak first.'"

My first meeting with Senator Jones was in 1878. I was talking to him in the Marble Room at the Senate, a delightful room with great, deep, red-leather lounging-chairs, and here was the "last of the Buffaloes" telling me, a young man, the tales of the golden West. A card was brought to him; he turned it over. "Joe Voshay! Why, it must be old Arizona Joe! I thought him dead long since." Presently Joe, an older man, appeared. They had been beleaguered by Apache Indians somewhere in the Great Desert near thirty years before. Joe had crawled out, been wounded, but had brought a rescue party to his friend. I shall never forget the talk between these two old prospectors reunited over all this time and distance. Jones had dined with President Hayes at the White House the previous evening. Hayes was a determined blue-ribbonist. "A cheerful dinner?" I asked. "Cheerful!" he said. "Why, water flowed like champagne!" It was near twenty years later, in Cleveland's term, at a time of great industrial prostration, that he said to me: "We have a man at the White House with no sense of humour; that is our trouble. No man lacking in humour can run this nation. The first President

I knew was Lincoln. Lincoln liked me, liked my stories of the West; told me good stories too. Times in 1864 were bad in Nevada; the 'boys' wanted post offices and small trifles of that kind. I had gone to the President with a considerable list. He signed them all. As I was leaving he said, 'John, go slow on this office business; remember thirty millions of people are knocking at my door, and all told there are less than a quarter of a million offices.' But a few days later some other good fellow had written me from the West, and I went again to the White House and found the President sitting on the sofa. Before I could tell him what I wanted he said, 'John, I am a sick man.' I said, 'Mr. President, you are. You have got all the symptoms of smallpox.' Well! that great man grasped my hand and said, 'The intention of an all-wise Providence is clear: I have at last got something that I can give to this entire nation!'* That *was* a man! But last night Cleveland asked me to see him as to the utility of reconvening the Brussels Monetary Conference of 1892. We soon got through with that. As I took my leave he said with a heavy dignity, 'Mr. Senator, I have just appointed Mr. Elliott to be Marshal for the State of Nevada; is that an appointment that meets with your approval?' I said, 'Mr. President, did you ever hear of Phelim O'Neale, who keeps a liquor saloon in Virginia City?' 'Never,' he said. 'Well,' said I, 'Phelim left his wife Biddy in charge of the bar the other evening while he went to his room, and presently Biddy whispered up the pipe "Phelim, is Tommy Maguire good for a drink?" "Has he had the drink?" said Phelim. "Sure he has," said Biddy. Then said Phelim, "He is."' But the President had no notion what I was driving at. Little wonder then that our people are in our soup kitchens!

"When in 1868 General Grant had just 'snowed under' Governor Seymour for the Presidency, it so happened that after the elections Governor Seymour and I were recruiting at the same hotel at Saratoga. The defeated Democrat was not merely dejected, but bitter. One evening he said to me, 'I don't mind defeat, but this entire campaign was unilluminated by a single act of generosity on the part of the Republican Party east or west.' I said, 'There, Governor, you are dead wrong. I could tell you of

* I regarded this as a Jones story, but it is a fact that Lincoln did have a mild attack of that dread disease in the White House.

many; I content myself with one. Your fellows out in Nevada were driving me hard. On the very election day I had almost lost hope. I said to my election agent, "Sheriff, have you really voted our whole strength?" He said, "Senator' I have and more. Many a man who died in his boots here ten years ago has to-day voted the straight Republican ticket." "Is there," said I, "no one at all on your conscience, Sheriff?" He hesitated and then said, "Well, George Foot, who has to be hanged to-morrow, I did not vote him. Seemed a little tough to trouble him with national politics his very last day." "Why," I said, "you are all wrong. Get George out; let him see the 'boys'; it will encourage him to-morrow should he play the citizen to-day." So the Sheriff voted him in each of our sixteen precincts, and I thought it proper to express my acknowledgment in person. The prisoner said, "Senator, I have thrown sixteen votes for General Grant; now let me throw one for the man of my heart, Governor Seymour." I said, "Sheriff, vote him for Seymour." It was his last wish in this world, and no doubt made his rather abrupt exit more agreeable. Now, Governor, how is that for 'illuminating generosity'? Conceivably it might have cost me my election."

Jones did not like Cleveland; but still less did he like his own President, Ben Harrison, an able man and a fine speaker, but frigid and uncompanionable. I was with Jones one night at Delmonico's, when an acquaintance of ours, who had dined not wisely but too well, came across, slapped the Senator familiarly on the back, and pointed to a man just leaving the room. A little ruffled, Jones said to the interrupter, "Well, what is it?" "A great friend of the President," said the other. "You don't say!" said Jones. "I have been four years trying to find that man!"

In the campaign of '96 I was more than once on his platform when he was preaching "Free Silver," and in the "enemy's country." It was the habit of the "contractionists" to heckle my friend about the size of his "sage brush" State, Nevada. The stammering wit of New York, William Travers of pleasant memory, was once asked why he stammered more in New York than at home in Baltimore. He replied, "Because New York is a much larger town." And interrupters often made merry with Jones as though the theory of the foreign exchanges was shorn of all dignity in the scattered peoples of the Rocky Mountains. One

evening at Buffalo I was listening with delight to his lucid exposition of this great exchange problem, when a young lawyer in the audience interrupted with, "What population has Nevada, Senator Jones?" Jones replied at once, "Pray what does our friend mean by 'population'? Does he refer to base Roman numerals? In a mere counting of noses I admit the inferiority of Nevada to this great State of New York; but if you consider the splendid individuality of each unit of our citizenhood and the far more than average excellence of their gun-play, then I think it must be admitted that Nevada is the most populous State of the American Union."

Tom Reed, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, was to the full as witty and ready as Jones, but, unlike Jones's, Reed's shafts were often barbed. Mr. Springer of Illinois, having on the floor of the House contradicted himself in a glaring fashion, found no better excuse than to say, "Mr. Speaker, with Henry Clay I hold that I had rather be right than be President." Reed, from the Chair of the House, said in a perfectly audible drawl, "The gentleman labours under the considerable disadvantage that he is never likely to be either." But Jones, confronted with a bore, overwhelmed him, shattered and silenced him with congratulations. I was dining with him in New York many years since, the evening papers being full of a shooting affair on the Riviera. A French gentleman had been killed by an annoyed American husband. Enter to us a supreme bore, uninvited, but who joined us full of the desire to lecture us upon the importance of "the American husband abroad"—the sentinel of the domestic virtues: "Let no man rifle that casket." For quite five minutes we endured this, when Jones caught our bore, the breath out of his lungs, and said. "What, shoot an unarmed man in his pyjamas? We don't behave like that over on the Coast. I was getting off the elevator at the Pacific Union Club in San Francisco last week with a friend of mine, luckily a man of nerve, when lo! a stranger with a gun said to my friend, 'You have got to die.' 'Die?' said my friend. 'Why, whatever is the matter?' Said the other, 'Since I have been over to New York you have been paying attentions to my wife.' 'Possibly,' said my friend; 'but what is the name, please?' 'Hiram Kimball,' said the gun man. My friend produced a note-book with a lettered index and turning to K said,

"Is it Mrs. Clara Kimball, or Mrs. Grace C. Kimball?" Said the husband, 'It is sure enough Clara.' 'But,' said my friend, 'does the lady object?' 'No,' said the husband, 'but I do.' Said my friend, 'Then as far as I am concerned that makes all the difference; I cross her off my list. Good evening.'" The jaw of the bore fell and of the fore-ordained mission of the American husband abroad we heard no more.

Senator Morgan of Alabama, who died but the other day, the senior by some years of Jones, typified the "southern chivalry" in the Senate even as Jones did the mighty West. I recall hearing Morgan say of the Senate: "We are the Ambassadors of Sovereign States." A fine conception of that body at its best, not at its worst. Morgan, albeit a man of real ability, was of all Senators the most verbose. Jones once said to me very happily of this colleague "Old man Morgan just starts his mouth running and goes away and forgets it!" Jones used to nourish carefully a select poker party at Chamberlain's Hotel in the early eighties, and here was filled in during progress of "the game" many legislative gaps and lapses. "Bring down," he said, "after hours Don Cameron (of Penn.) and George Vest (of Mo.) and Cal Brice (of Ohio) to play a reasonable game of poker, and when we are through, through too is the foolishness and the nation is saved. Even George Hoar and his too moral New England atmosphere will just discover us with the Royal Flush." Never was any one less likely to "discover" a poker party at Chamberlain's than Senator Hoar of Massachusetts!

Of his leader, Allison of Iowa, the father of the Senate, Jones quoted with approval Senator Ingalls as declaring: "If this Senate was carpeted with egg-shells the Senator from Iowa could cross the floor and not crack a shell!" "Allison," said Jones, "was travelling through his State one bleak April day; his friend said, 'Look at those poor shivering sheep; how wrong it is to commence shearing so early.' Allison said, 'Why, they do appear to be sheared *at least on this side*.'"

What stories there are still to tell! How my friend had bought a mine from the Stage Robber at Panamint. How his partner, Joe Owens, walking into Camp shot the two gamblers, and even pulled his gun all unaware on Jones! Of and about the great gold "rush" to the Fraser River and his hospitable invitation

to his banker on his arrival at Victoria to dine with him, as to time and place "when the tide is out and we can find them clams"! How the criminal about to be hanged in Lexington Jail begged the executioner to "get through with my business first," the alternative being to listen for an hour to Senator Joe Blackburn, dear to Kentucky, on the Wilson Tariff! Or again how "Black Jack" Logan, Senator from Illinois, dining with Jones nominated himself for the Presidency in 1880, and how little Senator Antony then and there burst the Logan "boom," and what Blaine said. The wonderful tale, too, of Billy Killingley, and how all Nevada refused to believe the desperado was really dead until Jones assured them he had "scared the crows off Billy's body on the prairie"! How often in polite society I have thrown a fly over him for one or other of these inimitable stories. If the temperature was not quite right I might get no immediate rise; the big fish would nose up stream and suck down other flies and then come back to the subsidence of my too splashing cast.

Did space allow I could fill an entire number of this Review with anecdotes of Jones; but their inimitable point, charm, and freshness are lost in the written recital. It was the way the dear old fresh-faced Senator told them that delighted his audience. One more story I should relate for its historic interest. On the Senator's return from the Brussels Monetary Conference he dined with me at White's, and during dinner Mr. Henry Chaplin asked him to tell us how he came by the great Comstock mine. Jones said: "There is no moral in the story unless it is to lend a friend anything you have about you. It was back in the *sixties*. I was living at a little wayside inn near where Virginia City now is. I was at the time 'broke'; so broke I hardly knew where to provision myself a week ahead. When a man is as near bedrock as that he don't want to mix with his fellow men and so after supper I used to go to my room and read poetry. But Wells and Fargo * put an agency in the little town, and the newly arrived agent proved to be a friend of mine from San Francisco. He said, 'John, there is a registered letter for you at the office.' I opened it and inside was a certified cheque on a Montana bank for sixteen thousand dollars. I had lent a friend a small sum six years before, and he had returned it, principal and compound interest. That made me feel good, and that night I went to a

* The Carter Patersons of the Pacific States.

Variety Show in the town, in place of reading poetry. As I passed in through the door of the tent my friend Charley Fair met me and said, 'John, have you got any money?' and I said, 'Yes, lots.' He said, 'Can I have four thousand dollars?' 'Why, I said, 'certainly you can, but what do you want it for?' 'Oh,' he said, 'old Comstock has struck a rich lead and he brings in six donkey loads of the ore. I can buy a quarter interest for four thousand dollars.' Said I, 'Can I buy another quarter?' 'Certainly,' he said. We fixed up the deal that night, and next morning rode out with Comstock to what was destined to be the great Bonanza Mine."

But the great value of John Jones to his time was in the vigour and independence of his economics. No greater Protectionist speech was ever made than his in 1890, "Shall the Nation do its own Work?" While he read every book, he adjusted every theory to a wide horizon on which economics were often obliged to play a very subordinate part. When I first met him five-and-thirty years ago, I was fresh from Cambridge and Fawcett's hands, and was obsessed by that sweating system we here call "Free Trade." More than any other teacher Jones convinced me of its immorality: the submission of our white race to an unrestricted competition in their own markets with black labour and yellow labour! "In the make-up of a nation," he once said to me, "the Art is more valuable than the Article." And again: "Free Trade brings the watch, Protection brings the watchmaker. Free Trade brings the machine, Protection the mechanic. Which shall we select? Men found communities, machines do not." What Jones taught was that the equitable distribution of wealth can only come through the highest possible rate of wages. What makes all business good, he would say, is the consuming power of "all the people engaged all the time and at the protection, not the competition, rate of wages." When the Protectionist nation has long enjoyed the "boom time," then the Free Trade nation will secure a short-lived participation—the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table. I sometimes thought that Jones carried his principles of Protection to a comic excess, and I offer one instance. He was the leading member of the Senate Finance Committee in 1890, and had at least as much to do with preparing the McKinley Tariff as William McKinley himself. One evening he said to me, "We had an interesting witness before the Finance

Committee to-day. He assures us that the fresh-water mussel, the raw material for the pearl button trade, exists in great abundance in many of the tributaries of the Mississippi River, and that given reasonable security against foreign competitors we can produce all our own shirt buttons." At that time all the shirt buttons consumed in America came from Austria. The result was that, instigated by Jones a high tariff was imposed on imported pearl buttons. To get inside the duties, the following year a firm with only £4000 of capital emigrated from Austria with half a dozen skilled hands and settled on the Wisconsin River in Iowa, where is now that flourishing pearl button metropolis Muscadine. To-day this town, created by a stroke of the pen in the McKinley Act, pays more than a quarter of a million sterling a year in wages to operatives in the button factories. At low water in summer the farm children gather the shells in the rivers, which they sell to the factories for £3 per ton. When I visited the little town four years ago, I was assured that the previous year, the children had found in the mussels, real pearls to the value of £30,000, and the price of pearl buttons is now forty per cent. less than before the passing of the McKinley Act. My old friend was exposed to much good-natured ridicule about his pearl button protection. *Si monumentum petis circumspice.* Muscadine is his monument; a thriving, expanding town with a business turnover of more than eleven million dollars annually, which makes a splendid local market for the farm produce of that fertile region.

Still more important, I think, was the real life-work of Senator Jones on the great problem of Exchange. He started on an investigation of this silver problem thinking, as others did, that it was merely a local issue of Nevada's mines. It presently disclosed to his enraptured gaze not only the whole question of Asiatic competition in our markets, but very largely the problem of prices and wages the world over. So lately as 1908, when he had retired from public life, a great friend of his and mine, the late General Warner, asked me to sound him as to whether he would, if asked, be a member of the National Monetary Commission which was at that time under discussion. Jones sent me the following reply, which was, I think, the final judgment of that acute mind on the world's currency, a letter which may suitably find a place in these pages now that he is no more:

May 5, 1908.

MY DEAR MR. FREWEN,

I have read your evidence before the House Committee with pleasure and conviction and I agree with the plan advanced by the late Lord Goschen; but whether or no, were I invited, I could serve on a new Currency Commission I cannot decide until I know the terms of reference.

I agree with your view that the trouble is not now with our currency or yours, but is in the exchanges between the West and the Orient. This involves us in the most complex economic problem of our time. For if gold prices are to continue to rise, as too surely they will rise, and silver prices to fall, and fall they must unless the Indian mints reopen and thus expand the Indian currency, what a crisis it is which looms ahead!

And yet it is this problem of broken exchanges with half the world, the bonus cheap silver affords to Asiatic exports, the contraction of her imports, the consequent favourable trade balances of Asia at our expense—it is just this which, for me, has ever constituted the real "Silver Question." This has been the burden of every speech I have ever made in the Senate. At Brussels in 1893, where you may recall I represented this Government, I laboured the exchange point with, I dare say, a painful iteration. But is any American Commission, groping in the dark as Congress is now groping, likely to happen on the remedy for this exchange dislocation from which our trade and your trade also must suffer more and more as Asia develops industrially?

But while I rejoice that you, and here and there a few others, are still to be found pressing forward to the light, I do not think that I dare again get down into the arena of this controversy. It is now over eighty years since I emigrated from England and took my family with me—a protest, I suppose, against Peel's legislation on currency then impending! A quarter of a century later I was amongst the earliest of the California gold-seekers. We there did what was mechanically possible to help the world forward toward gold monometallism; but I agree with you in thinking that the greater the supplies of gold the greater the dislocation of the exchanges with Asia, saturated with the silver money she has accumulated from times prehistoric. It is on this rock that in the end the gold shallop, freighted with all these strange theories of unrated "two-metallism," will founder, even though I may not be fated to witness the ultimate disaster.

There is nothing, it seems to me, stranger nor much sadder in history than the fact that public opinion has been so drugged and duped that it sees nothing in the exchanges with one half the human race excepting the price of the silver bullion of Nevada. The mills of New England offer cottons to China. China would wish to buy; but how can she buy when because of the fall in the exchange two of her dollars or two of her taels now buy less of our standard money than formerly did one dollar or one tael? And yet to-day the value of the dollar and the tael to pay wages in China and to buy the necessaries of life there, is steady or even rising.

Perhaps I may find the opportunity later to write why I approve of the Goschen currency compromise. More than that, I would gladly give evidence before a Commission, whether at Washington or Westminster, on the problems

of the foreign exchanges; but work, any real constructive work, I fear I must leave that to another generation.

With much regard, yours always faithfully,
JOHN P. JONES.

The views set out so concisely in the above letter show why before 1896 the writer had broken with the Republican Party, the party of Protection through the Tariff. Jones saw clearly that the Exchange Problem and the problem of the Tariff are one and indivisible; that a great fall in the price of silver has for all Asia the same economic result as though Asia had raised her tariffs against our goods; and this same fall also, by enabling Asia to get far more of her money (silver) for the sovereign or the gold dollar, makes the American or European Tariff inoperative to protect white workers against imports from the Orient. Not perhaps until, when half a century later, China is fully equipped for the world's industrial competition shall we discover the vast forces released by the lowered rates of silver exchange; not till then shall we appreciate the place Jones rightly occupies in the economic thought of the nineteenth century.

Had Senator Jones been less preoccupied he would have been a delightful writer of vernacular doggerel. I must conclude this hasty sketch with some verses he sent me many years ago, but which for the dignity of the Senate he stipulated must never see print while he was a member of that body. It is a lay of a Timber Camp in California, and will reflect for a later generation a world of quite unstudied rationalism which has now clean gone for ever, but which for all its archaic excesses laid the foundations of strong character in good citizens.

SILVER JACK'S RELIGION.

I was on the drive in 'sixty
Working under Silver Jack,
Which the same is now in Jackson*
And a'int soon expected back.
And there was a chap among us,
By the name of Robert Waite;
He was kinder slick and tonguey,
I guess he were a graduate.

Bob could gab on any subject,
From the Bible down to Hoyle,
And his words flowed out so easy,
Just as smooth and slick as oil.
He was what they call a sceptic,
And he loved to sit and weave
Highfalutin words together,
Saying what he didn't believe.

One day as we were waiting
For a flood to clear the ground,
We all sat smoking "nigger head"
And hearing Bob expound.
Hell, he said, was a humbug;
And he proved as clear as day
That the Bible was a fable,
And we allowed it looked that way.

* The jail in Auburn County, California.

As for miracles and such like
'Twas more than he could stan',
And for him they called the Saviour,
He was just a common man.
"Yo're a liar," shouted some one,
"And you've got to take that back,"
Then everybody started,
'Twas the voice of Silver Jack.

Jack clicked his fists together
And he shucked his coat and cried:
"'Twas by that thar religion
My mother lived and died.
And although I haven't always
Used the Lord exactly right,
When I hear a chump abuse him,
He must eat his words or fight."

Now Bob he warn't no coward,
And he answered bold and free:
"Stack your duds, then cut your capers,
For you'll find no flies on me."

And they fit for forty minutes,
And the boys would hoot and cheer
When Jack choked up a tooth or two,
And Bob he lost an ear.

At last Jack got Bob under,
And he slugged him wunst or twyst;
When Bob finally admitted
The Divinity of C . . . .
Still Jack kept reasoning with him,
Till the cuss begun to yell,
And allowed he'd been mistaken
In his views concerning Hell.

Thus that controversy ended,
And they riz up from the ground;
And some one found a bottle
And kindly passed it round.
And we drank to Jack's Religion,
In a quiet sort of way.
So the spread of infidelity
Was checked in camp that day.

With the passing of Jones the scenes have shifted; the wheels creak for the new Players and the new Play. "Who goes Home?"

But how those great actors stand out and how joyfully we would call them back to pass once more across the mighty stage they have adorned!

How they catch the eye of memory! The great tragedians from the South, relics of the War: Wade, Hampton, and Vance, Gordon of Georgia, Hill, the other Jones, he of Arkansas. From the North-east the two big men from Maine, Blaine and Reed. From Vermont, Justin Morrill. From New York, Evarts and Conkling. From New England, George Frisby Hoar. From Ohio and the Middle West, McKinley, Sherman, Allison, and Mark Hanna. From the Rockies, Wolcott, beyond question the most eloquent of all the honoured dead. From the Far West at this moment I can only think of Jones. "The West, there is no West," said the author of that delightful book, *The Virginian*, to me recently. In a sense this is true. There is "no West." The environment that created Jones of Nevada has gone with the Buffaloes and the Pawnees, never to return. *Pulvis, Cineres, Nihil.*

Moreton Frewen.

POLITICS IN THE LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL

It is to be feared that the London public takes little interest in London government. Yet the importance of keeping and securing control of the great municipal machine has never been denied or neglected by the great party leaders on either side. That Mr. Hayes Fisher, Lord Midleton and others who have played prominent parts at Westminster should have consented to work as Aldermen at Spring Gardens is some evidence that the politics of the County Council is not entirely of the parish pump variety; that on the very day that Mr. Balfour announced his resignation of the leadership of the Opposition he was to have been present at the dinner given by the Party in honour of Mr. Hayes Fisher is proof of the intimate connection between Unionism in Parliament and Municipal Reform at the County Hall. This wise appreciation of the political importance of London Local Government has unhappily not yet reached the understanding of the London elector or of the "man in the street."

The low polls at the triennial elections are an index of the public attention directed on the County Council and reports of meetings in various parts of London go to show that County Councillors of both parties devote their speeches as much to National Insurance and Land Taxation as to London Finance and London Education. They presumably supply the existing demand for the pure gold of politics, and have not yet created a demand for that baser metal of which local questions are composed.

Some of this apathy is no doubt due to the prevailing idea that there is too much politics on the County Council, and that the dissension which is often the creation of the party system is only increased if public opinion is directed upon it. Those who have

heard petty matters of administrative routine discussed and debated at interminable length by Progressive obstructionists, to be finally decided by a division with the Party Whips, may be pardoned the belief that under the present régime many mole-hills are made into mountains, and many mountains, after much travail, bring forth mice. This is strictly true of the present time, but it has only been true since the memorable victory of 1907 which saw the first triumph of Municipal Reform. In the days of the Progressive ascendency the opposition knew well how to confine their attacks to questions of principle and to leave administrative details to those responsible. The difficulties of local administration on the Party system can hardly be exaggerated. Ministers directing national services reach their decision in the privacy of their offices, subject only to the power of Parliament to criticise their actions: they get their estimates as a matter of course after debates in which members hardly claim to control expenditure and are satisfied with the opportunity to vent a grievance or to ask a boon. At Spring Gardens administration is public; the opposition are present in the office, with access to every file; the arguments used in Committee are always available in the Council Chambers. As the Chairman must come to the Council at every stage for every penny that he needs, it is obvious that there is no limit to the possibilities of obstruction. The Progressive Socialists have been for the last five years making futile but frantic efforts to promote unnecessary and extravagant expenditure, in order to force an increase in the County Rate and ridicule the party of economy; where that is the object secretly in view, an adroit politician can produce a debate, and often five or six debates, on almost any formal proposal submitted to the Council, in order to propose an alternative course involving a heavier charge on the public purse. This abuse of the party system, cunningly devised to promote a definite Progressive policy, is responsible for much of the delay often ascribed to municipal Red Tape, which creates the bloated agenda paper and the all-night sitting.

If party strife and Progressive obstruction have in some degree withdrawn public attention from the proceedings of the Council it is only because five years of wise and prudent government have removed many of the dangers to which Progressive misrule

had exposed the Metropolis. For the fear of municipal bankruptcy has been substituted the confidence of revived credit; the County Rate, up to 1907 mounting always higher, has remained constant at 1s. 5d. in the pound, in spite of the rise in prices, reduced assessments, and the host of new duties imposed on the Council.

In spite of new capital expenditure the net debt on rate services has been reduced from £40,432,555 in 1907 to £39,896,878 on January 1, 1912. The capital commitments of the Council have been reduced from £9,269,788 in 1906 to a total of £4,864,381 at the beginning of this year. That the credit of London has been well maintained is shown by the steadiness of 3½ *per cent.* L.C.C. stock. In the four years ending March 31, 1912, this stock has declined one point from 101 to 100, while the corresponding stock of the Government of India has declined seven points from 101¼ to 94¼. Yet these benefits of Municipal Reform must not be allowed to lull into a dull torpor the interest of Londoners which waxed so great in the days of their anxiety; if the ratepayer, already overburdened, is not to yield to further extortions, if his credit is not to be shattered by the weight of colossal capital commitments and wrecked by ambitious, though ill-starred, schemes of Municipal Trading, the enthusiasm of past campaigns must fire the future, and the triumph of six years ago must be repeated in 1913.

Such a victory is more than probable. The party prospects could not be brighter. Under the able leadership first of Mr. Hayes Fisher, and, latterly, of Mr. Cyril Jackson, whose lifelong study of social reform has admirably fitted him for the post of the Municipal Premier of London, not only has much good work been done, but many dangerous shoals have been avoided. The progress of Municipal Reform has been hampered and impeded at every turn by a Government determined to use every situation for Party advantage. Their tactical scheme has been so amazingly simple that he who runs can read it. In active alliance with the Progressives and the Socialists on the Council, the Government have decided that, to injure the Party pledged to economy, it is only necessary to force an increase in expenditure and to allow the Exchequer contribution in aid of rates to dwindle into nothingness.

They have made valiant efforts to add to the ratepayers' burden. The exchequer contributions in aid of the rates amounted

during the first five years the Progressives were in power to £600,000. Last year it was nothing. This year it is nothing.

Many, if not the majority of London's financial grievances against the Government are shared by all the other Local Authorities in the country. The need for the re-settlement of the relations between the Imperial Exchequer and the local exchequers, has been admitted at least since 1901. The Royal Commission on Local Taxation recommended largely increased Exchequer grants, and although the urgency of the question has increased from year to year, and culminated in the passing of the Budget of 1909, nothing has been done to redeem the repeated pledges of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Another enquiry has been instituted, this time by a Departmental Committee, on which London has been refused the representation which her representatives asked, and a question hitherto outside the limits of party controversy has been embittered by the successful efforts of the Socialists to raise the issue of the Single Tax, and the desire of Mr. Lloyd George to divert attention from the Insurance Act and Home Rule. But if nothing has been done to remedy an admitted grievance, the Government have not failed in their attempts to make the position still more acute. Anxious to get credit for quickening the pace of Social Reform without incurring the unpopularity of paying for it, new services, new developments, new duties of a national character have been imposed on local authorities, either by Parliament, or by Administrative Order, without any commensurate grant from the Exchequer. Thus necessitous children must be fed out of the education rate, at a cost of £96,000 a year, without any grant; medical inspection, also without a grant, is compulsory and costs £21,000 a year; and for medical treatment, which costs London over £24,000 a year, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has included in this year's estimates the ridiculous sum of £60,000 to be distributed in grants throughout the whole country. This service, it must be confessed, is called optional, though the term implies a degree of inhumanity with which even Radicals might hesitate to brand their political opponents.

The maximum number of children in the classes in Elementary Schools was very properly reduced to sixty by Art. 14 of the Code of 1909, but the hostility of Whitehall to Spring Gardens was clearly shown by the ruthlessness with which, in defiance of educa-

tional principles and in spite of the greatest administrative difficulties, this sudden change has been enforced. The provision of sites and schools is far more costly and difficult in London than elsewhere, and, as if because the problem was unique, the Government surrendered to the demands of their supporters on the Council and actually, in the summer recess of 1911, imposed a fine of £10,000 upon London. The supposed indecision of the Council, for which this monstrous injustice was declared to be a penalty, was the direct result, not of municipal inaction, but of departmental delay. The Council's letters lay unanswered for months, its proposals were strangled by red tape, and the judge who delivered the sentence was the real author of the crime. The effect of this supreme act of party spite—proclaimed by the Progressives as a great political success—was at once visible in the schools; the injury to the children, perpetrated in the name of educational progress, became apparent to teachers and parents alike. School halls had to be surrendered to the use of classes to gratify the Radical desire for precipitate and immediate reform.

The sincerity of the Municipal Reform desire for sound educational progress is sufficiently attested by the proposal (initiated last year, and after much delay in Whitehall adopted in March of this year) for the gradual reduction of the size of the classes, during the next fifteen years, from the present figure of 60 to 40 in boys' and girls' and 48 in infants' departments. This scheme, which will cost about £5,000,000, will without doubt place London far in advance of all the rest of the country and will constitute the greatest educational reform since 1870. The capital expenditure, when completed in fifteen years, will entail an additional rate of about 4½d. in the pound, apart from reductions due to extinction of debt, and at this great cost London will be secured from the danger of the tyranny and injustice recently experienced.

The history of this controversy has more than one lesson for electors and ratepayers. In the first place the superiority of a gradual and steady improvement to a sudden, rash, and ill-considered "Reform" is typical of the superiority of Unionist notions of Social Reform to Radical ideas of Social *Revolutions*. Revolutions do not work, and this case has proved no exception to the rule. Next the remarkable and growing power of Government Departments to control municipal expenditure is beginning

to command attention. If ministers and officials, without the sanction of Parliament, by mere administrative order, can force expenditure on this colossal scale, representative local government is at an end, and continental bureaucracy established. Lastly, there is the fact that towards this great local expenditure there is no Government grant. The Board of Education does not need to go to the Treasury for a corresponding increase of the Education estimates, although the Government grant per child in average attendance at elementary schools has fallen 1d. since 1906 to £1 19s. 3d., yet the gross cost of education in these schools has risen, largely through the action of the Board, from £6 15s. 1d. to £7 9s. 11d. There is no relation between necessary expenditure and the amount of Government aid.

Nor is it only in matters educational that the Radical Government, for party purposes, have endeavoured to create difficulties for Municipal Reform and to increase the weight of the ratepayers' burdens. The Lambeth Bridge scheme is a remarkable instance of the same policy. The unusual course was taken to use the machinery of the Party Whip for the rejection on second reading of the Bill introduced by the Council for the rebuilding of Lambeth Bridge. On the ridiculous grounds that the proposed bridge would be visible from the terrace of the House of Commons, and that it was not compatible with the dignity of the precincts of the House, the President of the Local Government Board summoned his loyal henchmen from Scotland and Wales and Ireland to prevent the scheme receiving the dispassionate criticism of a Parliamentary Committee, when the gradients of the bridge and the width of the roadway could have been patiently and properly considered.

The treatment of the ratepayers by Mr. Burns in this matter, is only paralleled by that of Mr. McKenna on the question of the Police Rate. The Metropolitan Police, unlike all provincial police, are controlled by the Home Office officials, who deserve all the praise which the efficiency of the force has evoked for so long, and for forty years four-ninths of the cost has been borne by the Exchequer, while the remainder has been met by a rate, in the Metropolitan Police District, of 5d. in the pound. In 1911–12, the last year for which figures are available, the ratepayers' proportion of the actual expenditure was 57·3 *per cent.*, and the Government reduced its contribution to 43·7 *per cent.* Meantime the cost

of the police force has increased; the conditions of their service have improved, and, largely through pressure of Unionist members, every constable is now entitled to one day's rest in seven. More money still is therefore required, and of course the Government decide to raise the rates of London and to advise their friends to blame Municipal Reform. By the Metropolitan Police Rate Act, 1912, Mr McKenna has taken power to raise the rate from 5d. to 7d. in the pound, and this has been done in spite of the protest of many Radical members, who were subjected to much pressure from their constituencies, without the production of any figures to justify more than half the exaction, and without the contribution of a farthing by the Exchequer towards the sum required.

It is in the face of these difficulties, deliberately imposed by an unholy alliance of Progressives and Radicals, that the administration of London local government has been carried on. It would be tedious to enumerate the long list of valuable reforms which even the last two years have seen. Steady progress has been maintained in all departments, in housing the working-classes, improving and widening the streets, in the development of tramways, in the great main drainage system and in the Fire Brigade. Countless educational reforms, besides the great scheme already mentioned, and countless improvements and experiments have been made. The largest slum clearance scheme ever undertaken in London has been not only formally adopted, but successfully launched. The advantage of a weekly rest day has been secured to all the thousands of workers in the numerous services maintained by the Council; an adequate superannuation scheme has been introduced for 19,000 School Teachers; the pay of the Fire Brigade has been very properly increased. A gigantic scheme for the decasualisation of women's labour has effected a marked improvement in the condition of 13,000 charwomen and school-cleaners; power has been obtained and a scheme formulated to assist workmen to buy leases of their own houses on easy terms, and, perhaps the hardest task of all, satisfactory arrangements have been made for the medical, dental, and nursing treatment of all of the 800,000 elementary school children who cannot obtain treatment for themselves.

In the face of such a record of administrative success it is not

surprising that those who for six years have been conducting a campaign of organised obstruction should now find impregnable the defences of Municipal Reform. Yet the battle must soon be joined, and Sir John Benn, the Progressive generalissimo, has already made more than one reconnaissance in force and has now settled the main lines of his strategic advance. In such difficult country he dare not face a frontal assault on Spring Gardens and meditates instead an insidious attack upon the whole of Municipal London. To take the County Council in the rear, he boldly attacks the Borough Councils, and openly declares for a great centralised and unified London. The ancient and honourable traditions of the City are to be swept into oblivion, the excellent work of the late Lord Ritchie's new corporations is to cease abruptly, and the County Council, controlling the whole vast horde of municipal officials, destroying the source and inspiration of local patriotism, is to reign in their stead. When the great municipal octopus can stretch its feelers into every dustbin, and force its inspectors into every nook and cranny of its great dominion, then and then only will Progressives find content. State officials, as Mr. Bonar Law has said, devour the land like locusts, but they have still left pabulum enough for the swarms which are to follow in the wake of triumphant municipal Socialism. Progressives affect to despise the voluntary services of 1589 men and women members of the Borough Councils anxious to devote their leisure to the service of their fellow citizens, but they will find that the people of London appreciate with gratitude these public-spirited services. There is a great and growing dislike of official interference, and a growing demand for the effective control of such expensive public servants. Does Sir John Benn believe that 120, or even 250 County Councillors at Spring Gardens, could keep touch between the people and their government as efficiently as can the 29 groups of Borough Councillors, each group working in its own district, each anxious for the machine to work smoothly in its own immediate area? Does he think that there is not enough red tape in local government now, or that there will be less under a centralised council ruling five million souls? The danger of this proposal has apparently penetrated at last into Sir John Benn's mind. His tardy announcement that the Progressive policy is not to abolish the Borough

Councils but to convert them into district committees to whom he will delegate local administration is not likely to deceive the ratepayers, but is some evidence that the unpopularity of unification is at last admitted. This *volte face* of course is only strategic. The County Council would still be absolute. The district committees would suffer the fate of the School Managers, who are always grumbling that they have nothing to do and complaining of the omnipotence of the ubiquitous official who leaves them neither power nor responsibility.

That the new Radical programme of centralisation is utterly out of touch with modern progress is amusingly illustrated by the example of Manchester. There there is growing a movement towards decentralisation. In a recent speech at Didsbury, Councillor Joseph Swarbrick advocated the division of the big cities, and declared that "Populous areas need County Councils to control their general affairs as well as *separately elected* district councils to administer smaller areas to which strictly local work could be delegated. After showing that local self government by elected representatives is impossible even in a city one-seventh the size of London, Mr. Swarbrick demands local officials for local duties, acting under local committees who can exercise better control than heads of departments in an unwieldy area such as Manchester. It is not for scavenging the highways or disposing of refuse or sanitary inspection that suburban districts have consented to be incorporated in our big cities, it is rather to share in the great municipal services of housing, main drainage and fire protection. such as in London are conducted by the County Council, that these large municipalities have been created. So the provinces actually wish to inaugurate the system under which London has so well prospered, and which Progressive politicians for Party purposes are threatening with destruction !

To emphasise the economy involved in local administration, there is a curious illustration from the ancient history of Manchester.

In 1876 [says Mr. Swarbrick], when the city was so small that most of the work had to be performed within less than a mile and a half of the town hall, the Corporation commenced to centralise its local services for the first time in the history of the city. A comparison showing the financial results of the first nine years, when the population decreased 4 per cent., shows that in four

departments, the percentages of increase in expenditure were 40 per cent. 12 per cent., 206 per cent. and 65 per cent. That period under central control should have been sufficient to prove that those who in 1874 thought that centralisation would lead to economy were sadly mistaken.

Yet all this in London is in the name of economy! It is enough to arouse a child's suspicion to hear Progressives speak in praise of economy after working for years to produce extravagance, and common sense supports such suspicion. It is ludicrous to believe that unification in London will spell economy; it is useless to juggle with comparative statistics to support an obvious absurdity. In a recent press correspondence Sir John Benn has shown to his own satisfaction that Birmingham is governed more cheaply than London. That is as may be, and is irrelevant to the issue he has raised himself. The one outstanding certainty is that the Borough Councils have in four years reduced their expenditure by £208,758, and if they were abolished the County Council would be forced to increase it. No one can imagine that the Progressives want economy. What they want is power, and in these days when money is power, an appetite for power means a lust for spending money.

The problem of London traffic now occupies a great deal of public attention, and the Progressive traffic policy is a good illustration of this appetite for power. To aid the municipal tramways in their competition with the railway and the motor omnibus, the modern demagogue would build tramlines where the people do not want them. To do this, he must throw out of gear the machinery of Parliamentary Government and amend the Standing Orders of the House which are designed to secure the people's wishes. Hence the campaign for the abolition of the so-called veto now exercised against tramways by the Borough Councils, and the typically Socialist demand of the Progressives to be litigant and judge in the same cause. Municipal Reform admits and proclaims the need for a judicial tribunal to decide in the interests of all London the conflicting claims of various kinds of street transport, and voices therefore the demand, first made by the Royal Commission on London traffic, for an impartial Traffic Board, but at the instigation of Sir John Benn his allies in the Government have refused the necessary legislation.

This strange idea of administrative justice is illustrated by another example of the recent suggestions of the Progressive leader. The police are the authority in London to issue hackney carriage licences, in the interests of public safety, to motor-omnibuses, as well as to cabs. Sir John would usurp that authority, in order, as he has darkly hinted, to refuse the licences, and make smooth the path of his beloved tramways. Such is Progressive Free Trade. Such is Liberal justice. And because Municipal Reformers reject this Machiavellian conspiracy, they are "killing the trams." The ultimate policy is plain to see. Because the police now need further power to regulate the routes and speeds of motor vehicles the County Council must control the police and subjugate this efficient force, the envy of the world, to the rule of a political Watch Committee. Even a Radical Home Secretary may have something to say to this!

The farcical alliance of the Socialists and the Labour party with the Progressives must soon be ended. The Socialist lion has devoured the Progressive lamb. The process of absorption is complete. The Fabian policy of the peaceful penetration of local government is crowned with triumph. The party which would swallow up the Borough Councils and control the police has already elevated Mr. Harry Gosling, the organiser of the Dock Strike, to a seat on the dais as Deputy Chairman of the Council. They have lent their support to the demand for a universal minimum wage. Their friends are demanding free Municipal nurseries for children. They will soon be asking for free boots, free clothes, and free homes, for municipal coal and municipal milk and municipal electricity.

Between such a Party and such a policy and the efficient and economical administration of Municipal Reform the electors will decide in March.

R. M. Sebag-Montefiore.

PSALMANAZAR

PSALMANAZAR as a man is a fascinating study, but his appeal is only to the student of human nature. His books are dead and never had more than a synthetic vitality. His famous account of Formosa is so dull that it ought to be more convincing, and is aptly described by the author, so often inept, as "a long-winded and multifarious dissimulation." Yet we find a man whom offhand, one would call an impudent and dishonest impostor not merely respected by all who knew him, but regarded with something very like affection, by that downright moralist Samuel Johnson. He certainly had no sympathy with the modern theory of compensating virtues. The lady with a temperament was what she was, and there was an end of it. Rousseau was a rascal in spite of his philosophy, or perhaps because of it. Virtue and vice must not be confounded. Yet Dr. Johnson tells Mrs. Thrale that Psalmanazar was the best man he ever knew: also "his piety, penitence and virtue exceeded almost what we read as wonderful in the lives of saints." He ends a "uniform life" by an exemplary death. His patient endurance of his last illness compelled admiration and suggested the well-known remark—"It is so very difficult for a sick man not to be a scoundrel." Dr. Johnson even goes so far as to assert, "He would as soon have thought of contradicting a bishop" as Psalmanazar—a somewhat ambiguous statement. Personally I doubt if he would have shrunk from the task, and even seems to recall instances of episcopal correction.

Such was Psalmanazar to a very shrewd judge of men. It is true he repented, and repented with sincerity, and the generous Johnson had rather a foible for penitents, and in particular religious penitents, but there must have been something more than penitence, something appealing in the man himself. In many ways

he wsa remarkable, in one unique. He is the only man as far as I know, except the man in the Iron Mask, whose real name has hitherto been unknown. I say hitherto, because I have a theory I will deal with later. His working name was a corruption of Shalmaneser, the celebrated King of Assyria, and was also the name of the great prophet, the Prince of Peace, of the Formosan Revelation. His birthplace was near Avignon, so he says. This has been disputed, merely upon that ground, but I think I have discovered the exact spot. His mother was a pious good woman, though of narrow circumstances. His father, of ancient but decayed family, and there was something in the decay which precluded his living nearer to his wife than five hundred miles, or contributing anything to her support.

The credit of his education must be shared between the Jesuits, the Franciscans and the Dominicans, and among them he learned Latin thoroughly, which was of the greatest advantage to him later on. The Jesuits at that time were the missionaries of the East, and their tales of heroism and adventure in China and Japan undoubtedly fired his youthful imagination.

His education completed at sixteen, he turned his attention to tuition, but appears to have spent more time in philandering with the mothers than teaching the sons. Then he finds his real vocation and becomes a wandering adventurer, and he early mastered the fact that for such a career a little dogmatic religion is an invaluable asset. His first pose was that of a young student in theology of Irish extraction, who left his country for the sake of religion. This however fell rather flat. He lived too soon, Ulster had not been invented for he discovered in his own words, "that while passing for an Irishman did not expose him to the danger of being discovered, it came short of the merit and admiration I had expected from it." So he used his recollection of the Jesuits' talk of the East, and became a native of Japan recently converted. A short sojourn in Protestant countries showed him the better way, and though still a Japanese, he adhered to his native faith which he justified by reason. So he wanders through Europe. Even visits his father, whom he finds upright and religious but still decaying, except intellectually, for the parent advises his son to waste no time with him, but to travel as soon as needs be through the Low Countries, where

it appears there is much generosity shown to men of parts and genius. So Psalmanazar travels on, suitably dressed as a Pilgrim in a robe he had stolen from a village church.

At Liege he falls in with a crimp for the Dutch army who turns out to be the proprietor of a café in Aix-les-Bains; with him he serves as a waiter, his pose relied on as an attraction for the visitors. Next he enlists with the Elector of Cologne, and, dismissed for inefficiency, re-enlists with the Duke of Mecklenburg's forces. All this time he never abandons his position as the unconverted Heathen. He maintained the position by being moral (which piqued the orthodox), not drinking, which he did not care about, and abstaining from bad language, which he found difficult, but a matter of practice. Then he further persisted in praying night and morning to the sun in an unknown tongue, and living on raw meat and roots. Thus he relieved the tedium of his military duties, until the regiment moved to Sluys. Now came his great chance.

Major George Lauder was Governor of Sluys: being a Scotchman, he had a natural taste for theological controversy. There was a Scotch regiment in the pay of the Duke of Mecklenburg, to which one William Innes was chaplain. A discussion was arranged by the Governor, in which William Innes and another Amalfi, the Minister of the Walloon church, were to examine into Psalmanazar's pretensions and act as theological assessors. Amalfi seems to have been an easy victim. At any rate, Psalmanazar claims a victory at all points. William Innes, however, with the shrewdness of a Scotchman, detected his man at once, but was far too canny to expose him: with the business instinct of his race he saw there was money in it, and from that moment, Psalmanazar was a made man. Failure was hardly possible—the combination ideal. To the imagination of the Gascon was added the shrewdness of the Scot. The only question was how to do it. The place was obvious. England has always been, and will always be, the happy hunting-ground of the religious impostor. It is unthinkable that a time will ever come upon this shore when the Jesuits cease recanting and the nuns escape no more. To a lad of Psalmanazar's temperament the temptation was irresistible. He was getting very tired of a military life although he congratulates himself on having successfully avoided

any fighting. Since his school days he had found serious work tedious, and Innes offered him the excitement and publicity he loved, and to one little more than a boy, in fact nineteen, the actual fun of it must have had a certain appeal. I do not believe he was ever a fraudulent impostor in the dishonest sense. It was a partnership, in which Psalmanazar found the imposture and William Innes the fraud. One detail had to be changed. Innes thought Japan a little dangerous. Missionaries and other pushing people had been there, and Formosa seemed a safer domicile, so a Formosan the accommodating convert became. Innes began by publicly baptizing him, rather in a hurry lest some rival should anticipate. George Lauder he was christened, after His Excellency the Governor. Then Innes wrote a full account of the remarkable conversion to Compton, the Bishop of London, who with the simple faith of his office accepted the story without question. The convert's discharge from his regiment is arranged, and the confederacy start for town. In spite of a violent storm, during which the excellent Innes took the first seat in the only boat, and refused to move, they arrive safe and theologically sound, for during the voyage Psalmanazar had translated the Catechism into the language of Formosa, and presented on arrival a copy to the Bishop. Success was almost immediate.

It appeared the convert had been abducted from Formosa by the treachery of the Jesuits and carried to Avignon. Refusing to become a Roman Catholic he was naturally threatened with the tortures of the Inquisition. After an escape almost providential, but assisted by five francs, he was fortunate enough to meet the convincing Innes, and sought under his guidance the protection of Protestant England. It was clear to all right-thinking people something must be done. Such a man could not be allowed to starve for conscience' sake in a Christian country. There was only one thing to be done—the one thing that always is done in these cases. A subscription must be opened for his maintenance, and the money came in well. For this rôle Psalmanazar had many qualifications. A thorough mastery of Latin, which he wrote and spoke fluently, a smattering of five other languages, to say nothing of Formosan, and above all, an admirable platform manner.

Father Fontenay, a Jesuit missionary, who had been to Japan and Formosa, challenged him to a public discussion at the Royal Institution, but the address of Psalmanazar kept him the ear of the audience, and he met the sceptical Father fearlessly at dinner on two occasions later with Sir Hans Sloane, and afterwards with Lord Pembroke—who to the end remained his friend—and further confuted the Jesuit by eating his food raw. His success was not merely social. Scholars declared his Formosan language to be real, because "it was so different from all they knew, both in respect to words and idioms." In this they were not absolutely correct, for the fifteenth letter of the alphabet of twenty words was our old friend Dam! Nor was his readiness confined, as often happens, to the platform. When asked by Bishop Burnett, "How can you prove you came from Formosa?" the answer was, "Well, if your Lordship (who had, it seems, what Disraeli called a Batavian grace) came to Formosa you would be in a very difficult position. You look as like a Dutchman as any that ever traded to Formosa."

Enough money was collected to send Psalmanazar to Oxford. The idea was that he should teach the Formosan language to a set of gentlemen who should subsequently convert the natives of that island to the tenets of the Church of England. At Oxford his success continued. No tea party was complete without him. Christ Church shuddered at his stories of human sacrifice. He had even eaten human flesh and still professed inability to see anything wrong in the diet, while admitting in every sense the error of taste. He pretended to work all night by burning candles till morning and not sleeping in his bed, and although he did not drink, affected to have the gout, as it gave him an added dignity with the Dons. William Innes all the time was in the offing, and between them the next coup was engineered. Psalmanazar published a full account of his early life and experiences in Latin, Englished by a Mr. Oswald, and giving a full historical and geographical account of Formosa, an island subject to the Emperor of Japan, which it was not, with splendid pictures and an introduction describing his conversion. Most of it was pure invention, and it always shows more invention than imagination, but Innes coached him up with Candidius—a Dutch minister who really had been there—and Varennius' account of Japan.

Here is shown the genius of the impostor. A duller man would have copied Candidius without acknowledgment; Psalmanazar refers to him only to correct and contradict, and gives chapter and verse for his statements. The book dealt exhaustively with the language, dress, religion and politics of the island. Nor was abuse of the Jesuits wanting. There was a certain method in this, because the Jesuits were the only people who could expose him. Father Fontenay was his enemy. In the face of the book his attacks were merely an attempt to discredit a man whose revelations he feared. Abuse of the Jesuits also appealed to Innes as a Scotsman in two ways. First they made the book sell, and secondly I am persuaded they soothed his Caledonian conscience as discrediting a faith he hated. The book was dedicated to the Bishop of London. The preface pointed out its object was to prevent the Bishop being deceived, and in the interests of Truth generally. . . . .

The real story of his life was this. One Father de Bode, pretending to be a Japanese, but really a Jesuit in disguise, persuaded Psalmanazar to rob his father, and take ship with him to the West. Then follows an amplified version of the story set upon the town by Innes, and a slightly glorified version of his actual adventures. Next comes a long account of his conversion to Christianity and then we get to business.

Formosa was an independent isle until a Chinese potentate Moryandanoo, having "ravished Japan by villainy, conquered Formosa by fraud." Affecting ill-health he took to his bed, and sent over to the Formosan deities offerings which were to interest them on his behalf; but they were not really offerings, but soldiers concealed in litters after the precedent of the Trojan horse. Forty soldiers were placed in each litter drawn by elephants. At the windows, the heads of oxen and rams disarmed the suspicions of the confiding Formosan, who, in the absence of any kind of national service, fell an easy victim to the unscrupulous invader. Thus was the dynasty established. The religion was a revealed religion. Originally the heresy of Sun and Moon worship obtained. Then two philosophers arrived who implored the inhabitants of Formosa to abjure this heresy. The true faith was very simple. They had only to build a temple with an altar. On the altar the hearts of 20,000 male children under nine were to be burnt, and the real

god would appear. However the Formosans rejected the philosophers and were duly chastened by a parody of the plagues of Egypt.

Then Psalmanazar, the Prince of Peace appeared, and all was well. The temple was built, equipped with a quick combustion furnace and a special grill. The children were burnt, and to every one's gratification the god appeared in the form of an ox. The sun and moon became merely governors to rule the world, and were worshipped only on common days and without human sacrifice. All depended on the form of their god. A lion or a bear was bad; an ox, calf, or lamb, good; a camel held out hopes, but the best of all was an elephant, which portended great prosperity. Polygamy was allowed, or the number of children would have fallen short, even though the first-born were exempt from sacrifice. If virtuous, after death you became a star, if not, you wandered eternally in the air. The laws were severe, and the poor well looked after, in both of which matters Candidius was put right. The Viceroy lived in a palace three miles round, and the houses were covered with gold. Also Greek was taught at the Formosan University. Although the masses were dark, people of quality were very fair, as they lived under ground in the hot weather, and washed with distilled water. This was artfully inserted, as the author himself had a sanguine complexion. Medicine was simple. You drank a hot potion, ran two miles and went to bed and woke up well. The language was explained by translating the Lord's Prayer, the creed, and the ten commandments. Being an island, shipping was not neglected, but took the form of floating villages, which were an extension of the Noah's Ark type. The book ends as it began with an attack on the Jesuits.

After the habit of their Society, they engineered a sort of Formosan St. Bartholomew, but were hoist with their own petard, and massacred in advance, and since that time no Christian has been allowed to enter their country by the Formosans, otherwise in religious matters tolerant to a fault. It is amazing to think that such stuff could have been seriously received. Still we have welcomed De Rougemont and believed in Dr. Cook, and in those days Formosa was a long way off and had not a tea shop in Piccadilly. However, received it was and with acclamation. The first edition was speedily exhausted. Translations into

French and German followed. If notoriety were the author's aim, he certainly succeeded. In his own words: "The common cry and the public papers (even then identical) did it beyond my expectation. I was cried up as a prodigy, not only by the domestic but even by the foreign papers."

Psalmanazar attributed his success largely to the continuous attitude of the Pious Pagan. "Who could imagine," he says, "that a youth of so much sense and learning, so seemingly free from ambition and other vices, could be abandoned enough to be guilty of such an abominable imposition and fraud, for the sake of a little plain food and raiment, beyond which he neither makes the least effort or seems to have the least wish?" Then he was an admirable controversialist. He invented the theory so dear to politicians of "What I have said, I have said." With him it was a fixed principle.

"There was one maxim I could never be prevailed upon to depart from, that whatever I had once affirmed in conversation to ever so few people and that ever so improbable or even absurd should never be amended or contradicted in the narrative." He had mastered the great truth that the only way to deal with a correction is to repeat the error with emphasis, and this he did not fail to do in the second edition eagerly sought for. But now a great misfortune overtook him.

It was generally felt that something must be done for William Innes. *But for him Psalmanazar might still be living in* anthropophagus error at Formosa, or a victim of the deplorable Roman superstition. Such zeal should not go unrewarded and it did not. Innes was appointed Chaplain General to the British forces at Portugal. It was an ill day for his ally. Psalmanazar was like Napoleon after quarrelling with Talleyrand. Nothing would go right. While Innes, to complete the parallel, always fell on his feet. Afterwards a preacher at St. Margaret's, Westminster, he survived a scandal about the offertory, and then stole and published as his own a book written by a fellow countryman entitled, "A modest enquiry into the origin of Moral Virtue" —dedicated it to the Lord Chancellor, who was so impressed by its merits, that he gave him a valuable living in Essex, where Innes died universally respected. There can be no doubt Innes was Psalmanazar's evil genius, nor apart from dishonesty a very

edifying companion. Psalmanazar says: "He had an almost insurmountable propensity to wine and women, and when fraught with the former, fell immoderately foul of the latter, whether maid or married, not scrupling even to use violence." From which he draws the not uncharitable inference, that Innes had no real regard to religion "either natural or revealed." Not that Psalmanazar was a prude during the half-score or dozen years admittedly spent in the most shameful idleness, vanity and extravagance, he confesses to some sort of gallantry with the fair sex, and hinting that hardly any man might have enjoyed a greater variety of romance, expresses almost an astonishment at his own moderation.

With the departure of Innes Psalmanazar was more vulnerable. The translation into French of his book brought into the field his old antagonist Amalfi. Critics became more critical, and even his admirers began to wonder if the story was not too good to be altogether true. He became suspect, the patrons fell away. Even the papers made fun of him. The *Spectator* in 1711 announced a performance of "The Cruelty of Atreus," in which Mr. Psalmanazar fresh from Formosa would perform the leading part, "eating his children to the stimulating music of cymbals."

With the true instinct of the born impostor Psalmanazar felt, the time had come for a disappearance. He retired from public view. Then a gentleman named Pattender invented a white paint. It was an excellent paint, and Psalmanazar was persuaded to father it as a Formosan discovery. Yet notwithstanding its virtues and, in his own words, "their care and artifice to conceal its real faults (for some it had)" the thing did not go. Here the want of Innes was felt. With his business instincts there would, one feels, have been a fortune in the venture, and we might have been decorating our houses with it to this day.

He afterwards emerges as clerk to a Dragoon regiment, where he posed as Sir George, having been knighted by Queen Anne. After two years he again found himself at a loose end, and like the ruined heroine of the old-fashioned novel, took to fan painting. So late as 1716, a clergyman was still found to believe in his Jesuit revelations, and subscriptions brought him in some £30 for a few years.

Then came the last and not least extraordinary phase. He

came across a theological work called *Reformed Devotions*, which impressed him. Nelson's *Method of Devotion* brought him further light. Then a borrowed copy of *Law's Serious Call*, which he omitted to return, completed his reformation. The skin of imposture was shed, and for nearly fifty years he led a life of hard work and exemplary conduct. A casual acquaintance with a printer led to his translating books for the press, and so he gets "A comfortable Living." Now he shuns notoriety as a penance for his misdeeds and publishes everything anonymously. His capacity for work is astounding. A general history of printing is his. To "the Universal history" he is a considerable contributor. An essay on miracles excites attention. Next to "the blessing of God" he attributes his health and capacity for unceasing work till eighty-four, to taking twelve drops of Sydenham's tincture of opium in a pint of small punch every night before going to bed.

Such is his life in Ironmonger Row, pious industry supported by punch and relieved by the society of the Club which met in an Old Street public-house, where he talked with the metaphysical tailor and was not contradicted by Doctor Johnson. The unclubable Hawkins says of Psalmanazar as an old man: "Scarcely any person, even children, passed him without showing him the usual signs of respect." Smollett in *Humphrey Clinker* describes him as "having drudged half a century in the literary mill in all the simplicity and abstinence of an Asiatic: he subsisted on the charity of a few booksellers, just sufficient to keep him from the Parish."

Many years before his death, he commenced his Memoirs. According to his instructions they were not published till after his death. There he tells his story and makes its apology, but not the best or the real one—of that in the nature of things he would be unconscious. The real justification was geographical—his birthplace and its early associations. He was born near Avignon and a true son of the South. Can there be any doubt that Tarascon was the spot? As Alphonse Daudet says: "There are no Baron Munchausens in the south of France. The Southerner does not deceive but is self-deceived. He does not always tell the bare truth but he believes he does. His falsehood is not false, it is a kind of mental mirage. The only exag-

gerator in the South is the sun that glorifies everything it touches," and can we have any doubt that Psalmanazar himself was a direct ancestor of the immortal Tartarin. The evidence is conclusive. Do not we remember how Tartarin having been offered the management of a business at Shanghai, and refusing with the prudence which tempered his adventurous personality was so interested in the affair that at last he firmly believed he had been there, and was always accepted in the Club as an authority on the life and adventures of the glorious East. So strong is the influence of heredity!

Such at any rate is my excuse for Psalmanazar, and it is borne out by the fact that his conscience was only awakened after twenty years, under the grey skies of England, and I believe owe more to its climate even than to *Mr. Law's Serious Call.*

H. C. BIRON.

EXPERIENCES AT A GERMAN SANATORIUM

OR "ZU HARTMANN'S"

PEGGY was convinced she needed a "cure." Perhaps it was the weather gave her this depressing conviction, but having given Bob leave of absence to fish in Norway, she sighed and resolved to be "cured."

"But why?" I asked, "you are all right."

Peggy drew her hands down over her hips and thoughtfully contemplated herself in a long glass.

"You forget my ancestors," she said.

"Forget them too—and forgive them, for I think they did very well by you."

"I have an inherited tendency to gout, and when one begins to consider the possibility of 'getting on,' when, as Dante says, one enters the gate 'where all hope is abandoned'——"

"My dear Peggy, that was the gate of the lowest Inferno!" I interrupted.

"No—it was thirty-five! 'Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita!'" she turned and nodded at me. "You, too—you are getting nervy, and don't sleep well—that is the beginning of all troubles, so——"

"No, really Peggy——"

"So," she continued remorselessly, "we are going *together* to that place in Germany from which May Barfield returned a New Woman—it did simply wonders for her!"

"I don't want wonders, this summer is bad enough without suggesting German sanatoriums!"

"No, only one," said Peggy, "and it is just this kind of utterly hopeless weather that leads one to fulfil the penance

evidently demanded of one. So, my dear, we will go to 'Hartmann's,' that is the man's name who invented the treatment we will undergo."

Finally Peggy had her way and we went.

The old German town is enclosed by gently rising hills, pine-covered, and up the broad roadway climbs and clanks the electric tram, up and up, until "Zu Hartmann's" one has a complete view of the town, twined round about, and in and out by its attendant river. It is convenient, that old town, in many ways, perhaps the most legitimate to dwellers at "Hartmann's" being its opera and theatre. We were given rooms in one of the many villas that wait on the central establishment; we were thus numbered, and took our places as part of the immense sanatorial, hygienic, "back to Nature" machine, that was to make New Women of us. As we arrived late in the evening, the last meal, which is from 6.30 to 7.30, was over, and a "reception lady," who had given us our numbers, consigned us to the care of a small page-boy, and promised supper should be sent to our rooms.

I shall not easily forget Peggy's face as she bent over that tray.

"Don't you long for something nice and warm and comforting?" she asked.

"I do," I answered with a shiver. September was beginning, and proving itself no better than August, which—well every one knows what this summer has been, there is no need for words, it is beyond them.

"Well," continued Peggy, "there is some sour milk, some variegated slices of cold sausage and tongue, some tiny squares of black bread and some icy-looking green grapes!"

"Say your grace and fall to! You insisted on dragging me here to live the 'Simple Life' or 'back to Nature,' or anything else suggestive of general discomfort, and I am appalling hungry!"

After this repast we sought our beds, made with hygienic sheets, against which I have nothing to say—the chill was off.

Next morning we were initiated. We answered, as best we could, a long paper of questions dealing with our entire life and also that of all our near relations. We tried to be truthful, but Peggy confessed she "went for" her ancestors. Then a very firm, but benevolent doctor, he who had made of May Barfield a New Woman, took us in hand, and separately we entered his

sanctum. Peggy took first turn, and left me studying the names of some dozen doctors on the doors of their rooms, which opened on to the waiting corridor. She came out rather flushed holding a little blue book, and took my seat without a word, as I entered the open door.

When I reappeared, also holding my *little blue book*, and fully conscious of every kilo there set down as belonging to me, Peggy jumped up—

"Well, what table are you put at?" she asked eagerly.

"The—the—" It would not out.

"The Corpulent?" Peggy seized my arm.

"Yes, he says it will do me good to 'ab nehm' (off take)."

"Oh," sighed Peggy with relief, "then I don't mind going there, too. Nothing would have induced me to go alone to such an insultingly named Tisch (table) as that of the 'Korpulenten.'"

"But you *came* for that," I argued, disguising my relief. "Ah, I suppose he sent *me* there to keep *you* company."

Peggy and I nearly quarrelled as to which one of us the other was indebted for this promotion. For really, in matters of weight and size it *was* promotion, as we realised when we took our places in the particular dining-hall so designated.

There were many dining-halls, reading- and writing-rooms scattered about a garden of rain-drenched roses, dahlias, and geraniums, all being in a clearing of the surrounding pine forest; and there, too, we found the "Damenbad" and "Herren-bad," the "air baths" enclosures, and somewhere in amongst the trees were the "Wald-liege-Halle" (Forest-lying-Halls), places of great tranquillity, where, wrapped like mummies in brown blankets and stretched on long chairs, the worn-out patient rested from the more energetic phases of the "Kur." A prudent "Mädchen" tucked one up, and should any snorers venture to disturb the peace, a kind but firm hand recalled him (it was generally a "him") to better manners.

Armed with our blue books which contained our programmes, we entered the "Damenbad," here the "Bath Mistress" handed us over to one of the sturdy Teutonic damsels, who, clad in striped blouses and broad knickers, with mackintosh aprons and bare feet, bustled around, and like so many babies the "gracious ladies" had to submit to every species of tubbing.

Peggy looked round the big room and consulted her book—then asked, "What is your form of torture? I suppose I go into one of those!"

Down the centre of the room were ranged "Kasten" (boxes) as like those seen in pictures of Chinese tortures as any I have ever met. There were long wooden boxes, and high wooden boxes, and low crouching kinds of boxes, and out of each one appeared a head, some red, some patient looking, some with eyes closed, while others turned distractedly and a plaintive voice tried to attract the attention of the bustling maidens.

One would come, take a look at the thermometer in the lid of the box asking "Does the gracious lady sweat?" and unless the answer were satisfactory, and the face bore out the statement, she turned a screw—more heat—or she plumped a cooling bandage on a heated brow, and said calmly, "Ten minutes more, gracious lady."

Clad in a variety of gowns and wrappers, a multitude of "gracious ladies," of all sizes and ages, scurried round, calling their respective "Linas" and "Berthas" and "Lottas" or "Annas," and then they were either shut up in a "Switz Kasten," or behind yellow mackintosh curtains, popped into big baths, electric, pine, and many another variety, and from sundry splashings and little cries of "Ohs," and "Achs," one realised that the hose was being applied—cold!

When I emerged from the hands of my "Anna" I looked around for Peggy, and out of a reclining "Kasten" I saw her hot little face appearing, while her curly brown locks hung limply over a wet bandage.

"Like it?" I asked.

"I am being baked alive!" gasped Peggy; "it is all electric light inside, and that unsympathetic girl has just turned on hot steam, and I am to 'do' for five more scalding minutes."

"It is back to tropical Nature that you have gone, then! I have come from an Icelandic douche, after having been scrubbed like a floor. I suppose it is all to the New Woman's benefit."

We dressed in cubicles, and went out to take our "second breakfast," which consisted of a hard little pear and half a dozen nuts. The first meal had been limited, and taken between the early hours of seven and eight. A small cup of coffee—not made

from coffee berries, neither tea nor coffee nor any wine could be found on the premises—two inches of black bread, a baby rusk, and fruit, so between ten and eleven o'clock another breakfast (so-called) came as almost a necessity. I never thought so many pears and apples would fall to my lot in life, but some people had eggs and milk and big slices of bread and butter! Again, I never thought to envy any one a real slice of bread and butter!

The Management is generous with its "Cure"; you can have something done to you almost every hour of the day if it is written in your little book, but you must rest or eat or walk between the treatments, and it is only in the afternoon that the messy "Fango" (mud) cure is given, when, reclining on beds, the victims are partially plastered with this black substance, applied hot, and are rolled up tightly to stew for half an hour or an hour. Very comforting is this process to those whose ancestors have handed on the "bitter taste" of the fine old port they loved.

Some six to seven hundred fellow sufferers were collected at "Hartmann's," but the Germans and Russians, of whom they mostly consisted, men and women, regard this form of summer outing much as we do our spring cleaning.

It is a very good thing to be done up and put in order once a year, and then any little over-indulgence is rectified, and with a clean slate you can cheerfully start anew.

There were several other "Tisch's" besides that of the "Korpulenten"; the "Normal" being the largest, and from all accounts those who sat around it got good value for their money! Then there was the "Vegetarien Tisch," and that of the "Magen" for those suffering from what our American cousins call "Stomach trouble"; also the "Sugar Table," for those who might take none; and our own select hall, where, sequestered from the vision of more ample fare, our portions were carefully allotted us.

We sat down to our first "Mittags-essen" rather shamefacedly, but on looking round recovered our spirits, for the guests here upheld the title of our table; we were badly below the average.

A liberal portion of meat was placed before each one and a small dish of vegetables, any and every sort with the exception of potatoes. The table was plentifully supplied with large bowls of lettuce, deliciously fresh and green, the only dressing being

lemon juice. Of this even the most "Korpulent" might partake "nach belieben"; it supplied the only liquid allowed, and one looked in vain for such accessories as salt, pepper or mustard; also bread was nowhere to be seen. A small portion of "compôte" finished the repast. That was the one square meal; for supper the *pièce de résistance* was a small dish of vegetables, very well cooked, and we learnt that boiling does away with 80 per cent. of the good, therefore steaming is the only way! This all too limited a portion was supplemented by two microscopic slices of black bread, a tiny saucer of cream-like cheese, a cold apple or pear, and a glass of sour milk.

We learnt to resemble that "child of modest mind," who neither sought nor asked for "more than it did find." Peggy began by quarrelling with her portion; if one could not have more, at least one might show an independent spirit by eating less! But a few days brought her into line, and we all ate what was put before us.

A pathetic little incident proved the touch that made all at our "Tisch" feel very much akin. "Kurgäste" came and went, having completed their three to six weeks' reformation, and two elegant Viennese, their figures brought into a suitable condition to meet their autumn toilettes, departed, and their places, just opposite us, were taken by an elderly couple. She, of that good-natured type which seems bound to overflow in fat, and he, thick-set, and suffering doubtless from her too bountiful housekeeping.

They arrived in time for the "Abendmahl," and sat down opposite the tiny squares of black bread, the glass of cold milk, and some green and hard-looking grapes.

They looked dubiously at this frugal fare, and one could almost share with them the vision that rose of the comfortable cheering meal which was their "daily bread." A good "Suppe," excellent "Braten," succulent "Kraut," all washed down with sparkling "Bier." And to this they had come! Why, oh why? She turned from that cold comfort and looked at him, and he at her, then back to the sour milk and cold grapes, and both of them shook with laughter. She placed her fat hand on his fat hand, and all down her, from triple chin to vanishing waist-line, the laughter rippled. They laughed and laughed until the tears ran down,

and we, in one sympathetic burst of merriment, shook with them.

"Oh," cried Peggy, impulsively stretching her hands across the narrow table. "It is not as bad as it looks; you do get something else!" and the serving maiden, one broad grin, shouted, "Sie bekommen noch 'was!"

But when the "noch 'was" was presented to them in the form of a small dish of French beans, they bubbled over again. It did seem inadequate.

They soon fell into line, and I think I was sorry to see the blouse begin to fall in over her ample bosom, while his hands certainly developed knuckles. They grew, as did we all, to take the greatest interest in the process of "abnehm"-ing (off taking), not only of themselves but of all their neighbours. One can have no idea unless one sits at a "Korpulenten Tisch" how absorbingly interesting the subject is.

"You by the Herrn Doctor to-day have been? Nun, how much then has the 'gracious lady' off taken? Two kilos? and in two weeks only! but that is colossal! No!" And then all round might be heard "Two kilos! and in but two weeks!"

Or, again, a portly "Herr" would own up that owing doubtless to sundry visits to the theatre and supper, "Ach ja! a little supper!" he had lost but half a pound this last week, and now the Herr Doctor gave him two "Obst Tage" a week. "Ja wohl!—off take that must I!"

"Obst Tage" (fruit days), when only fruit was to be eaten, these began to be the cry. Peggy, who would at all cost reach her correct weight, some six pounds less than the present turn of the scale, insisted that her doctor should write her a weekly "Obst Tag" in the little blue book: without such permission one sought to starve in vain.

But when, armed with his authority, the serving maid presented her with a bowl of fruit only, apples, pears, grapes, and bananas, the old gentleman opposite, who took an interest in us, exclaimed indignantly, "No! Why that—you wish then more to off take? But why, you are not thick! what weigh you?"

We were all truthful, and indeed Peggy and I were secretly proud—another good result of sitting at a "Korpulenten Tisch"—for we should have found lighter weights at other tables, though

many very corpulent ones were placed at the "Normal," supposed to be mentally unable to stand the strain of our stricter fare.

Peggy owned to her sixty-nine kilos, which, considering her height, was not much in excess of her allowance.

"Sixty-nine!" cried our old friend, growing red in his energy—"but sixty-nine kilos only! And you will off-take! My wife here ninety-two has! By what doctor are you then? Ach! the Herr Doctor Streng; but he there, he will that all even so long and thin as himself to be shall! No, take you not off, else become you no good health."

He was quite perturbed—there was no sense in it, sheer vanity, and it ought not to be permitted.

"I twenty-five kilos off-take should," murmured his wife gently, "but I do it not—no surely I do it not."

She also did it not; but she surrendered, with some pride, to diet, "Switz Kasten," and massage, some nine to ten pounds—though what was that among so much? And then, like the majority, she would doubtless go away, to return next year and repeat the process.

One of the most novel and special requirements of the "Kur" was the "air bath" to be taken by the "Korpulents" as early as possible, but I found nine o'clock quite sufficiently drastic.

For this performance one needed but little—that little was a butter-muslin garment of a simplicity! just a chemise.

Attired in this airy fashion one would take a hasty run through the pine wood, enclosed very strictly for "Damen" only (the "Herren" had their own quarters, "mixed bathing" was not allowed), and indeed as one breasted the air, cold, damp, windy and chill, it took away one's breath even as do the salt waves, and much energy is required to satisfy one that cold is not being caught. Summer, autumn, winter, the "Luft Bad" is one of the most important features of the Cure.

But for my first appearance the sun shone; it was one of our two fine days, and Peggy was otherwise engaged, so after half an hour's hard drillwith a "Fräulein" and some thirty other similarly clad ladies of various ages and sizes, I found myself strolling among the pine trees, feeling in the warm sunshine more like a

poetic wood nymph than usually falls to the lot of mere mortals. Try it! in a unique muslin garment and sandals.

Basking on a seat in the sun—it would have been of marble had Alma Tadema been allowed the arranging of the scene, but it was really only a wooden bench!—there reclined in quite appropriate fashion a figure in pink. Over one ample shoulder slipped a narrow ribbon that did duty for a sleeve, and sandals, strapped on crosswise, adorned the feet. Not little feet, nor like pink shells, and the golden crown of hair was of that tint that never grew on mortal head. I am sorry to spoil a charming picture, but my Venus was not seventeen—she was nearer the reverse of those figures, ungrateful though it is of me to say so, considering all things.

She smiled at me—ah! time is cruel, once doubtless she had been pretty, now one only longed in common humanity to wrap around her a plenteous shawl and to tie a cap under the cheek that hung so loosely—poor ancient Venus!

I leant against a pine trunk and remarked in answer to her smile, that the sun was a treat.

"Ach! sen you are Eenglish. I am so many goot friends with ze Eenglish ladies—and in London I have been. I lov' so much ze shops and I let make me many dresses zu Redfern. Ze Eenglish ladies are so chic: but I am of Vienna, of course——" the shoulder was raised out of the escaping ribbon.

I paid the necessary compliment to Vienna and its clothes.

"And you kom here for your healse? but why sen? You look so fresh, so young; you might have only twenty-sree years!"

And I could not rise! No, my tongue refused the awaited "retort courteous." I only laughed, laughed like a silly, and stammered something about the delusive effect of a blue muslin chemise.

The ancient Venus was plainly disappointed in me. She asked rather coldly at what table I sat, and I told her the horrid-sounding truth.

Then she rose—the lines of a pink silk chemise were no disguise to the amount she ought to "off-take."

"I by the 'Normal' am," she said with dignity, "there we become very good eating. There sit I always, I come all years to make the cure. The soup is excellent—you of the 'Korpulenten Tisch' become no soup."

"Nope," I said, "with us 'Korpulenten' it is very strict."

"Ach so!" and nodding as though to say it was very necessary for *some* people, she waddled away.

When next I met her, a hat of huge dimensions and literally toppling over with the new carrot-coloured plumes, adorned the golden crown of hair, and the lightest, tightest pale mauve garment swathed her form. She bowed very coldly—I was evidently more "chic" in my blue chemise. Peggy sniffed when I told her the story, and said I had better keep to it. But Peggy, too, had had her adventure, and perhaps that had ruffled her. She had been to her "masseuse," and the dressing accommodation being limited had found herself behind a curtain with another lady, also attiring herself. Peggy said she had a shock. The kind of shock one experiences on receiving a letter of "faire part" from a French friend announcing a death in the family. The depths of woe depicted on its black border were equalled by this lady's garments; they mourned past all remedy.

Peggy described everything as black, even the lace on her black undermost garment, and she sat in speechless contemplation—was it grief? or to save the washing?

The lady put on a shoe and began to talk.

"For me it is terrible that I cannot walk, but I cannot. When my 'Mann' wishes that I with him go, I cannot—I have so small feet."

"Really!" said Peggy.

"Ach ja!" The English ladies have big feet—colossal! So long are the feet of the Englishwoman." She measured two feet of air.

Peggy hardly knew if this were a personal insult, or national, but she accepted it calmly.

"We walk a great deal, and play many games. For that one must have the sensible shoe. Also perhaps it makes the foot larger."

"N'ja—they are large the feet of the Englishwoman—and flat are they, but quite flat—flat and long—so long!" again the air was measured and then flattened.

Peggy began to feel a rising sensation, and then Peggy's eyes "blue-sparkled."

"Let me see your foot with which you cannot walk?" then

she laughed. "But see, your heel is in the middle of your foot, so high and pointed! Of course you cannot walk when your poor 'Mann' asks you to go. What a pity! Only because you wear so silly and unhealthy a shoe to make your foot look half its size. So can any one get a small foot, but at what a price? No—to walk, to play games, to be healthy, that is much better. You try it, you have a good-sized foot!"

The lady buckled a tight black belt, took up long black gloves, and leaning on a tall black parasol, much like the Chinese lady of the past, she tippled away, saying to Peggy as she went:

"Play games! Yes, that can the 'Fraus' of England—I have too small feet!"

We made our "Kur" with religious regularity, did Peggy and I, and it kept us both busy and tired; but on others their duties sat more lightly, and getting through as much as possible in the morning, they devoted the afternoon and evening to excursions and theatres, and motors hooted up and down outside the many villas. One form of outlet, however, lay at our very doors. An astute German, with a profound knowledge of human nature, Teutonic and other, had opened a roomy café opposite the very portals of the Sanatorium, and chance led us to discover in what manner many of our neighbours "made the cure."

"But kom, you two ladies," urged a friendly little Frau who sought every opportunity to improve her English, "kom for jus' one time to the café, by him goes it very gut! You become ze tea, here you have him nie."

"My doctor said he was poison!" I answered with the obedience learnt in my German school days.

"Ach! *was!* Meeses, you bring sen your lady friend."

So we accompanied Frau Schmarmgut, and there we found most of our friends.

A dear little German girl of eighteen was there, who with pride had told me her age and shown me her new possession, a wedding ring! She and her "Mann" were enjoying a luscious chocolate cream cake, "something good to taste must one have!"

Tall glasses of "Bier" were before many; others made away with sandwiches, "Beooutiful is here the harm's butter-brod—try it only, gracious lady," whispered our friendly Frau.

We had perforce to order something, "One tea with two cups," did not sound excessive, and was as faint a bow as one could well make in this "House of Rimmon." How good was that tea! and how we all laughed and talked and treated our "Kur" as a jest—just like naughty school-boys in a "tuck-shop" out of bounds! And we smoked! ladies and all, which, of course, with any alcohol, came under the many "darf nichts" of our House of Bondage. But here rebellion was in the air, and when some one opened a window there was a general outcry, "What a draught—shut it! shut it!"

The proprietor, who waited on the guests in his shirt-sleeves, mocked us and laughed, "And you come all from Hartmann's!"

Peggy and I retired early and did not repeat the experiment. We had no need to come to Germany to learn the value of "sauerstoff" (oxygen), so much preached by the doctors "Zu Hartmann's"; but it has not yet become a German habit.

We made good resolutions all our homeward way; "a fine bit of paving," as Peggy remarked, and she summed up in most unselfish fashion, "If ever Bob develops a waistcoat, off he goes to Hartmann's!"

M. Landon.

AMERICAN AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON, *December* 7, 1912.

OF all countries in the world one would least expect that the United States lived in the eighteenth century and its dead hand regulates the affairs of the nation to-day. Americans who spend their holidays abroad are always fond of telling of "quaint" English customs, of forms and observances, of traditions honoured because age makes them romantic, but they forget that no matter how quaint these customs and how obsolete certain forms they do not interfere with progress. It is only in the United States that the eighteenth century still lives and a nation's business at its fountain head is conducted according to eighteenth-century methods.

When the Constitution was adopted—in the eighteenth century—there was neither telegraph nor wireless nor telephone; steam was undreamed of, the automobile was not even a fancy, the aeroplane no imagination conceived. It was a day when locomotion moved on legs, human, horse or mule; when the man-propelled canoe or the sluggish sail boat on river and lake was the only means of conveyance. The country covered a vast area, it took days for news to circulate, often weeks, sometimes months. Wisdom required that a long time should elapse between the election and the end of the term of the President, for it would take many weeks before the result would be known and official notification be sent to Congress. So the election was held in November and the President's term did not expire until the fourth of the following March, and four months were none too long for the votes to be certified and the new President, slowly travelling by horse, to reach the capital.

What was suitable in the day of the stage coach is ridiculous in the era of steam and electricity, but so deep-rooted is Con-

servatism in America, so wedded are Americans to their idols of traditions, that the methods of the eighteenth century are still those of the twentieth. Mr. Wilson was elected President of these United States a month ago, which was at the same time a notification on the part of the people of the United States that Mr. Taft's services as President were no longer desired. Roughly speaking about half the members of the House of Representatives and a great many members of the Senate were at the same time notified that their places would be filled by other men, yet Mr. Taft still remains the Chief Executive and the men who were voted out of office still remain in authority. Now the curious thing about this cumbersome system and the clinging to antiquated methods is that every sensible person recognises its absurdity. "It is one of the queer features of our political life," remarks the *New York Times*, "in what we like to call a democracy, that it takes ordinarily more than a year for a change of parties in Congress to have any practical effect;" and the *Times* simply voices what a great many other newspapers of equal standing and many intelligent persons know and say. Although Mr. Wilson was elected in November and will assume office in March, under ordinary circumstances Congress would not meet until December, that is thirteen months after the election, although the defeated members of Congress would cease to be members after March 4, but their successors would simply be members-elect, as a man does not become a member until Congress meets and he takes the oath administered to him by the Speaker. Mr. Wilson deeming that an extraordinary occasion exists Congress will be convened in special Session next April, so that in five months after the election the party whose policies were sustained at the polls will be able to begin the work of putting them into effect. One would expect more speed from Americans, but speed and the eighteenth century are incompatible.

Meanwhile Mr. Taft remains President with a moribund Congress on his hands, one half of which is politically opposed to him. There is a nominal majority in the Senate but an adverse majority in the House, and under the circumstances it is hopeless to expect that any legislation of importance can be transacted. The Democrats being as absolutely in control of the House here as Mr. Asquith is in London, they can pass any legislation they may

agree on, but the American "House of Lords" is very different from the devitalised British Upper Chamber. Save for one restriction, the Senate has equal power with the House. The Senate may not originate any Bill raising revenue, the taxing-power being the sole privilege of the House, but even that restriction is more academic than real, for a taxing Bill passed by the House can be "amended" by the Senate, and under the form of amendment the Senate can strike everything out of the House Bill except the title and write in a new Bill of its own. It is the same with Supply Bills. There is no constitutional prohibition against the Senate originating Money Bills, but by usage they originate in the House and are sent to the Senate for concurrence, where they are invariably amended. When the House, Senate and President are of the same political party and working in harmony these differences are easily reconciled, but when the House is of one party and the Senate of another agreement is not so easy. At the present time the Democrats hold the whip hand over the Senate, for if that body should pass Bills to which the House objects, all that the House need do is to let the Bills fail to become law and then at the special Session pass the Bills of which they approve. Under ordinary circumstances it is necessary that the Supply Bills be passed before March 4, as the fiscal year ends on June 30, and failure to make provision for the Government's needs between that date and December, when Congress must meet under the Constitutional provision, would bring the operations of the Government to a stop. After March 4 the Democrats will have an overwhelming majority in the House, a slender majority in the Senate and the Presidency. They will therefore be in complete control of the Government, the first time, it may be added, in twenty years. Party changes have been less frequent in America in the last quarter of a century than in England.

With the exception of voting about two hundred million pounds to keep the Government wheels turning for the twelve months beginning next July Congress is not likely to do anything of great moment, although there will doubtless be a great deal of political discussion. It is the last chance a great many men will have to be heard, and they will want to avail themselves of the oppor-

tunity. The men who will be members of the next Congress, the Democrats especially, like athletes training for a great race, will want to keep themselves in condition, and will be vocal. But this will be talk merely, a thing that is very dear to Congress, but it will lead to nothing.

It is more interesting to forecast the work of Congress after Mr. Wilson becomes President. The principal work of the new Session will be the passage of a Tariff Bill that must reduce the existing rates of duty if the Democrats are not false to their pledges made before the election, and there is little danger of that. They are in a mood to cut into the tariff, what a great many people fear is that they will cut so deep and with so little skill that instead of mending they will destroy. From the standpoint of the extreme Protectionist any reduction they make will be destructive, but there is a general impression that the Democrats will act with moderation and wisdom and will not smash the rates simply for the mere pleasure of smashing. If they do, of course, it may be another twenty, or even twice twenty, years before they come back into power. Despite the wail of the demagogues and the efforts of agitators the country is in a wonderfully prosperous condition and the only scarcity is labour. In many parts of the country the demand for labour is greater than the supply, and naturally under these circumstances wages are very high and employers are willing to concede advances rather than to risk having to close down because of the inability to supply the places of the strikers.

Prices still continue to be high, but they are higher psychologically than they are actually. I mean by this that much of the complaint about high prices is a state of mind and the result of suggestion rather than fact. For some years now "the high cost of living" has been dinned into the ears of the people. Public men, university professors, sociologists, economists, whose names mean something and those whose names mean nothing, faddists, extremists, theorists, notoriety-seekers, clergymen, doctors, lawyers, socialists, capitalists, everybody in short who could obtain a hearing has preached or written or been interviewed on the high cost of living. Beginning as a matter of serious discussion it has been seized upon by the humorists and paragraphists of the Press, snapped up by the comedians of the stage (as the one

joke that required no explanation), commercialised. "The remedy for the cost of high living" greets you in flaming letters from the advertising pages, and you read that if you trade at Skinem and Cuttem's you can save fifty per cent. Or you are told to stop eating meat and to use Quackem's predigested, super-heated, double-distilled extract of concentrated peanut shells in olive oil, one teaspoonful (eaten hot or cold and flavoured to taste; endorsed by the medical profession as especially valuable to old men, young mothers, athletes, babies, school children, policemen, grand opera singers and professional men) is the equivalent of a pound of beef-steak, a bushel of potatoes, a quart of beans and a mince pie, without any of their injurious effects. And if this isn't convincing you may compare the cost of a bottle of Quackem's with the price of a pound of beef-steak and potatoes and beans and mince pie due to the nefarious operations of the beef trust and the potato trust and the bean trust and the high tariff on mince pies.

I do not invent, although I may plead guilty to slight exaggeration. The public has been told that it is not necessary to eat meat or vegetables, or drink milk because Professer Boozleum, the great authority on nutrition, has discovered after laborious investigation that three prunes, an orange and a piece of bread two inches square seven days old is all that a labouring man needs to support life; whereupon an enterprising purveyor of the public wants, puts up a prune extract that is ten times more life-sustaining than the fruit out of which it is supposed to be made and retires with a fortune. It is this sort of thing that has created the psychological high price. You cannot tell a whole people the same thing day after day, week after week, month after month for a series of years without it making some impression, and as every student of anatomy knows there is no organ so sensitive to impression as the pocket nerve. It cannot be denied that prices are high, but it is equally true that wages are high. Recently I saw a table giving the wholesale prices of commodities as compared with the increase of wages of railway conductors (guards) during the last five years, and the ascending curve of wages closely followed that of prices. I think the same relation exists in practically all other classes of employment. The salaried man, of course, is worse off than the working man because salaries increase much more

slowly than wages, but the general level of salaries is higher than it was.

But whether high prices are psychological or actual is not of much consequence so far as the public demand is concerned. The public having insisted that the tariff must be reduced to bring down the cost of living, the Democrats must either satisfy that demand or admit they came into office under false pretences. The Republicans say the Democrats will be unable to make their promises good, for two reasons. One is that the tariff has nothing to do with prices and the duty is not added to the cost of the consumer, but as that involves the whole theory of protection I need not go into it and merely mention it as one of the reasons why the Republicans predict the Democrats will go to smash. The other, and perhaps more important, is that the working man cannot profit at both ends, high prices make high wages, and if prices are reduced wages will fall. What the working man wants (and not alone the working man but everybody else) are the high wages and salaries of to-day and the comparatively low commodity prices of ten or tweny years ago. The working man may grumble at high prices, but he will revolt at low wages.

Democrats say prices can be safely reduced without any danger to wages or any disturbance to business. That is the problem. If the Democrats can do this, if they can give a man more meat and more eggs for his dollar than he gets to-day, and still put as many dollars in his pay envelope at the end of a week as he is receiving to-day, then the Democrats have nothing to fear from Republicans or Bull-Moosers or Socialists or Suffragettes or parties or reformers yet unborn. They have solved the great problem of life. They have done more than make two blades grow where none grew before. They have accomplished what in our childhood we were told was impossible, the great miracle of all miracles. They have made it possible not only to eat the cake but to have it, and that every nursery knows is beyond the power of the greatest magicians. But can they?

My own opinion is that the Democrats will disappoint their friends and confound their enemies. The American will probably continue to pay as much for meat and butter and eggs and boots and hats and motor-cars and diamonds, after the passage of the

new tariff law as he does to-day, and the wages of the working man will probably not be affected. This opinion is founded on the impression I get of Mr. Wilson and the wisdom and moderation shown by Mr. Underwood, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee (the Tariff Committee of the House) and his associates in the last Session. It is very difficult for a layman to say what the effect of tariff reduction is on any specific industry, especially as the men most concerned, and who are supposed to have precise knowledge, do not agree, but from all that can be gathered, balancing conflicting statements and striking a just average, if the Democratic Tariff Bills passed at the last Session had become laws (the refusal of the President to sign them prevented their going on the statute books) no real injury would have been done to the great indutries of the country, and it would not have been necessary for manufacturers to reduce wages to enable them to hold the domestic market, as against foreign competition. I repeat, I cannot say this with authority, because the wisdom of a law is its application, but this belief is further sustained by the confidence shown by manufacturers. They do not fear disaster, neither has business come to a standstill because of the uncertainties of tariff legislation. Usually this fear calls a halt. Manufacturers curtail their output and merchants buy in small quantities until they know whether the goods on the shelves will be cheapened by tariff reductions, but this year there is no slackening in trade. Commercial reports from all over the country tell of factories running full time and merchants buying freely; the public has money to spend and is spending it generously.

While the tariff will be the most important subject to receive the attention of Congress there will be others of scarcely less importance and having equally far-reaching consequences. At the present time the United States is the only great country that has no national income-tax. Nearly all the States levy a tax on incomes and impose death duties, but these are solely for the benefit of the States and no part of them is paid into the national treasury; but a federal income-tax the Supreme Court has held to be unconstitutional, and to meet this objection an amendment was proposed to the Constitution giving Congress power to levy a tax on incomes, the proceeds to be paid into the

national treasury. The Constitution can be amended by three-quarters of all the States voting in the affirmative, and as all but two of the necessary thirty-six votes have already been secured, and those two will be added before the winter is over, when Congress meets next April an income-tax law will be passed. This will greatly increase the federal revenue and meet any deficit that may be caused by the reduction of the tariff, or it can be used for a special purpose, say the increase of the Navy. An income-tax, it is computed, ought to yield at least £20,000,000 a year, or the price of ten battleships.

It is also promised that the fiscal system of the United States will be modernised, and it cannot be done too soon. The present system also savours of the eighteenth century, it is another of the traditions that Americans have clung to because they are too conservative to make changes even although it has long been evident that change was imperative. When money on the New York Stock Exchange lends at 20 per cent. although there have been no failures and no one questions the solvency of any great bank, it is evident that something is wrong, but money panics are the rule in the United States simply because the currency system is so unscientific and so crude that it is useless just at the time when it ought to be most useful. The Democrats promise a scientific and modern currency law and if they give that to the country, the business men not alone of America but of the whole world will be ready to pass them a vote of thanks, for when the American money market is disturbed the money markets of Europe usually have to pay for American folly.

American politics are always mystifying. It was expected that the great interest in the election, with three candidates in the field and the bitterness between the partisans of President Taft and Mr. Roosevelt, would result in a larger vote being cast than ever before, and the increase of population in the last four years should, on a normal basis, have added at least 10 per cent. to the vote; but the vote this year was approximately half a million less than it was in 1908, and this in spite of the fact that some 400,000 votes were added by the enfranchisement of women in Washington and California, who for the first time cast their ballots for a Presidential candidate. The Democratic Party lost

approximately 200,000 votes on the unofficial returns as compared with the vote of four years ago, and the Republican and Progressive vote combined was 300,000 less than the Republican vote in 1908, but the Socialists increased their vote by some 400,000 which would account for four-fifths of the missing vote, and is food for serious reflection. Mr. Roosevelt frequently asserted that his candidacy was necessary to check the spread of Socialism, as the Socialists would vote for him rather than for their own candidate. The increase of the Socialist vote does not bear out this assertion, and it has been estimated that at least 50,000 women in California voted for Mr. Debs, the Socialist candidate for President. Socialism is making tremendous strides in the United States, and it is one of the forces to be reckoned with in the future. In seven states Mr. Debs polled a larger vote than Mr. Taft, in nine states the combined Taft and Debs vote was larger than the Roosevelt vote. Another equally curious thing is that the temperance vote (the Prohibitionists put a candidate in the field) fell off nearly a hundred thousand, and yet it is common knowledge that the temperance cause is gaining in this country. The mystery of a vote below expectations may be explained perhaps at some future time, for the present one newspaper suggests that the smaller use of money is the reason why there is less interest taken in politics. In a word, the only way to get men to the polls is to pay them to go there.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie, who has a genius for getting his name in the newspapers, has recently obtained more than his customary share of publicity by offering to create an endowment to pension former Presidents of the United States. Instead of thanking Mr. Carnegie for his generosity, the newspapers with one accord have fallen upon him and told him that he is an impertinent and intolerable meddler, and that any former President who would accept his charity would disgrace himself and the country and cast reproach upon the high office he once filled. The nation, most of the newspapers say with lordly indignation, can afford to pay its own pensions and does not have to delegate that duty to a private citizen; members of Congress are either sarcastic or denunciatory. This is all very fine, but it does not pay pensions. Of course the nation does not have to seek assistance to pay its

pensions or other obligations, but that is not the question. The question is will Congress vote pensions, and without the slightest hesitation the question can be answered in the negative because, as one newspaper remarks, "we want no endowed national figure-head, set apart like princes of the blood;" yet the country insists that a man who has been President must do nothing to lower his dignity. As few of the Presidents have been rich men and it is impossible for them to save much or anything from their salaries they must support themselves by their own efforts after they leave the White House, but they must not capitalise their prominence. They may, with propriety, take certain cases at the bar or edit a newspaper, they must not become company directors or do anything that is "unethical" according to the fine code of newspaper ethics. Thus Mr. Cleveland, who was a poor man and had a family to bring up and educate, was condemned because he accepted a retainer from a life insurance company, and yet it is known there has been more than one former President who has been hard pressed financially when he left the White House. The newspapers have raised such a din about Mr. Carnegie's offer of pensions that it is not likely any self-respecting ex-President can now accept it, and Congress is even less likely to pension them, so former Chief Magistrates will have to get along in the best way they can.

"I say to you that if we refuse to arbitrate it, we shall be in the position of the merchant who is known to all the world to be false to his promises." This is what Senator Root said to the members of the New York Chamber of Commerce a few days ago in referring to the Panama Canal tolls and the declaration of many members of Congress that they would not consent to the question being referred to arbitration. Mr. Root, always sound and logical, a man of high purpose and distinguished as a former Secretary of State no less than a present Senator, has from the first maintained that the United States cannot without loss of self-respect refuse to accept arbitration, but he is in the minority, and Congress—or rather the Senate, for it rests with that body alone to say whether an arbitration treaty shall be ratified—shows no disposition to refer the question to the decision of an impartial international tribunal. The leisurely way in which the British Foreign

Office is proceeding would indicate that it does not regard the matter as urgent. Although the Panama Act was passed nearly four months ago, and some weeks before the Bill was signed by the President it was known that British vessels would be discriminated against, no formal representation has yet been made by the British Government to the State Department, so that it is now quite impossible for any agreement to be reached (even if the Washington Government should interpose no obstacles to arbitration) before the end of Mr. Taft's term. If it takes the British Government four months (probably it will be a good deal longer) to make up its case, the American Government will probably require equal time in rebuttal, and that, of course, is only the beginning of the negotiations. At the present rate of dawdling the end is a long way off.

A. MAURICE LOW.

THE BLACK MAN'S LAND

THE OLD AND THE NEW LAND POLICY

THERE are two alternative land policies in West Africa: the Northern Nigerian, and what may be generally described as the Gold Coast Land Policy. It is now proposed to introduce the Northern Nigerian system throughout all the West African Colonies in substitution for the latter.

In British West Africa there are twenty million natives inhabiting about half a million square miles. The exports are about ten million sterling; which represent the produce of the land, mineral, agricultural and natural.

British West Africa comprises five Colonies: Gambia, Sierra Leone, Gold Coast, Southern Nigeria and Northern Nigeria. Northern Nigeria came under the Crown by transfer from the Niger Company in 1900. The other four Colonies have been British for a long time; the Gambia and Gold Coast for two hundred years; Lagos, the capital of Southern Nigeria, became British in 1861. But the period of the Commercial and Political Rise of the four Colonies really dates from Mr. Chamberlain's assumption of the Colonial Office. He was a good friend to West Africa: men and money were freely, wisely and successfully employed in what this statesman described as the Development of Unimproved Estates. The Gold Coast system was introduced in 1900 on Mr. Chamberlain's instructions and it has, in the main, worked well and given satisfaction to Europeans and natives and there is no demand for its reversal.

The four older Colonies have each separate legislatures and different laws. But the Land Laws are similar. Putting aside the Gambia, Sierra Leone and Southern Nigeria, let us examine the Land System and Legislation of the Gold Coast, which may

be taken as in every way representative. The Gold Coast is not only the oldest of the British Colonies in West Africa, but it is therein that during the last two or three decades European enterprise in mining and other concessions first began and has been most widely developed. On the Gold Coast Colony moreover we have the benefit of the Belfield report published July 1912.*

Twenty years ago there was no legislative control of alienation in West Africa: an African might sell, lease or buy as freely as in England, either to an African or European. Previously the European only wanted an acre or two for his factory with its compound and wharf. He was there for trade only.

In the "eighties" there arose a European demand for "Concessions" covering large areas for purposes which may be differentiated into five classes, as (*a*) mineral, (*b*) timber—*i.e.* mahogany cutting, (*c*) agricultural, planting rubber or cocoa, (*d*) grazing and (*e*) sylvan or gathering natural produce, palm oil, kernels, natural rubber.

European adventurers or experts, never acquainted with the language, arrived at the Gold Coast and applied through interpreters to the native chiefs for a mineral or timber concession. Frequently from ignorance of boundaries or ignorance of European mensuration, two or more European concessionaries received from the same chief, or from two or more chiefs, overlapping concessions. Sometimes, no doubt, but rarely there was fraud; it must be remembered the land was not surveyed. The interminable litigation which resulted called for legislation.

The first legislative solutions proposed in 1894 and 1897 were similar to the Northern Nigerian system viz., that land should be vested in or administered by the Government. To this the natives vigorously objected as being confiscation of their land. They sent a deputation to Mr. Chamberlain who admitted their objections were well founded and withdrew the proposed legislation. In lieu thereof the Concession Ordinance 1900, still in force, was passed on his instructions. Mr. Chamberlain was "Master in his own house" and could control Governors and permanent officials. Under the Concessions Ordinance the prospective European concessionary has to approach the chief and make his bargain with him, which teaches both that the latter

* 1912 (Cd. 6278).

is the owner of the land. Next the matter goes before the Concessions Court, to inquire whether proper persons are parties, whether they understand, whether terms are reasonable, and customary rights of people protected. Then there is a survey and, if no opposition, certificate of validity is issued, whereby the Concessionary gets a title *in rem* good against all the world. The payment, which consists of a sum down, usually about £250, an occupation rent about £30 and after mining commences a full rent about £300, is made to the Government *who pays over the whole to the chief;* he keeps a third for himself, a third for the "Stool" and a third he gives to the elders. Agricultural concessions are subject to the sanction of the Executive but under similar conditions the natives being the grantors and payees; the Governor's sanction being endorsed on the deed.

In January 1912 Mr. H. C. Belfield, C.M.G., an experienced official, was sent out as Special Commissioner to inquire into the twelve years' working of this system. He stayed over two months, took the evidence of forty-four witnesses, a judge, officials, mining managers, the European lawyer representing most of the mining companies, five native lawyers and several native chiefs, and also educated natives. His report was published about July 12. Mr. Belfield finds as facts:

1. That while the Crown extends its protective authority to all places and persons in the Colony, there is vested in it no right of ownership in any lands save the forts on the coast with the adjacent area and land specially acquired, and any endeavour to extend those rights otherwise than by the legal process of acquisition would amount to a breach of faith with the people.

2. That all the land belongs to the people. The land is divided among tribes with boundaries which, though approximate, are known. The tenure of this land is communal with the exception of individual land usually near the coast towns. The land not required for tribal use is vested in the chiefs and elders and the proceeds applied as above explained; misconduct and misappropriation being punished by removal from office. Mr. Belfield in his recommendations approves of the principle of the chief and elders being the grantors and payees of concessions to Europeans subject to official intervention.

But such intervention must be conducted in a manner which will leave the people assured that their inherent right of disposition of their lands remains in their own hands, and that only such interference is contemplated as will supplement their knowledge of essential detail and obviate the risk of their unknowingly making bad bargains, while leaving to themselves the right of election as to whether the land applied for shall be disposed of or withheld. On no account must the fact be lost sight of that the land is the property of the people, that a concession is a contract between the landowners and the applicant to which the Government is no party; that intervention must therefore be limited to supervision and guidance only, to the end that improvident alienation may be prevented and only such terms sanctioned as will ensure adequate protection of the rights and requirements of present and future generations.

Such a land system appears to combine the minimum of interference by the State with the maximum of protection for the subject. One quarter of the premium and rent, he recommends to be retained by the Government to be expended locally on works of permanent public utility. He recommends the abolition of the Concessions Court and that each kind of concession should be passed by the Executive. This might be theoretically better, but the native has a great liking for being heard in Court and will always prefer the decision of a Law Court exalted above the arena of the administrative conflict to the decision of the most fair and honest official. He testifies to the bonâ fides both in representative constitution of membership and financial status of the Gold Coast Aborigines Protection Society consisting of chiefs and educated native traders and lawyers. This is the Society which has criticised in the past Government Bills and is opposing the present proposals.

The legislation above described only controls alienation wherein Europeans are the grantees of concessions, but the legislation is carefully worded so as to prevent a European syndicate acting through a native as a catspaw to evade the law. The legislation of the other Colonies varies somewhat; Sierra Leone has a Concessions Court with an alternative sanction by the Executive. In the Protectorate of Southern Nigeria alienation by natives to Europeans requires Executive sanction, while in the Colony of Southern Nigeria there is complete freedom of alienation.

Native land tenure and dealing between native and native is left to Native Common Law and there is no legislation thereon in

any of the four colonies. The Gold Coast natives are on the whole content that the Government should control alienation of land to Europeans though they prefer the sanction being vested in a Court rather than in the Executive. Several of the natives who gave evidence before Mr. Belfield were content with some, if not all, of his recommendations. State intervention over concessions is not unreasonable. The African is full of common sense in business and bargains, but concessions are novel to him and require complicated clauses. Moreover though the chiefs and elders are personally interested, yet they are called up to act on a representative capacity like the tenant for life of a settled estate.

In Northern Nigeria the law is entirely different. The surface owner has no benefit from the mine. In 1902 Sir F. Lugard declared to the Sultan of Sokoto: "The Government will have the right to all minerals but the people may dig for iron and work it subject to the approval of the High Commissioner and may take salt and other minerals subject to any excise imposed by law." * Legislation followed on these lines so that in Northern Nigeria the surface owner derives neither dead rent nor royalty from the European-owned mine. One does not see on what basis of right this vesting of all mines in the Government can be justified. It is not the law of England, whereby mines belong to the surface owner except mines of gold and silver which belong to the Crown. Probably the reason why this Crown prerogative was allowed to subsist after the abolition of 1660 of the feudal tenures, is that gold and silver mines in England are as unimportant as the prerogative rights to whales and sturgeon. The tin mines of Northern Nigeria according to evidence before the Commission of 1908 were worked by the natives previous to the coming of the European Companies who sometimes, at all events, expelled the native worker. Generally in all European concessions—mines or other—the native of Northern Nigeria has neither voice as to the grant nor benefit from the workings; the application is to Government who receive the rent; any natives actually on the land are, however, entitled to compensation.

Apart from European concessions, the Land Proclamation of 1910, has regulated native land tenure throughout Northern Nigeria. It has been enacted that all land occupied or unoccupied

* Blue Book, N. Nigeria, Report 1904 (Cd. 1768), pp. 58 and 153.

(except the Niger Company's land) is to be "native land" under the control and disposition of the Governor and no title to occupation or use is to be valid without the consent of the Governor. The Governor is enabled to give a certificate of right of occupancy at a rental to be revised every seven years. Such right of occupancy devolves upon death according to native custom. But the occupier has no right of alienation *inter vivos*, either by sale, mortgage or transfer of possession, without the previous consent of the Governor and any such attempted alienation is null and causes a forfeiture of the right of occupancy. As regards involuntary alienation by execution or bankruptcy the Proclamation is silent. This legislation applies not only to farms, but to houses in urban sites. This legislation was the result of the Report of the Committee of 1908.* But it is open to criticise the constitution and proceedings of the Committee. The report involves the absolute denial of the natives' property in the land he occupies and it is the report of a committee who were in a hurry—their instructions were to hurry, they took evidence on six days and finished in two months. All the members of the Committee were officials or ex-officials with the exception of Mr. J. Wedgwood, M.P. The character and good intentions of these gentlemen is unimpeachable and unimpeached. But when the issue to be tried is as to the ownership of land between the Government and the natives, can it be satisfactory to the latter that the majority of the tribunal should be employees or ex-employees of the former, especially when their verdict is in favour of the former and the latter has no opportunity of being heard either in person or by counsel?

With one exception, Mr. J. Holt, all the witnesses were officials or ex-officials. Besides J. Holt and Company the only other European traders in Northern Nigeria were the Niger Company. They declined to give evidence on the ground that the subject being of great magnitude it was impossible to consider it in the few days given. The Committee began its sittings on June 1, 1908; the Niger Company were only invited to give evidence on July 10 and the Committee closed its evidence on July 17, and reported July 29, 1908.

Another important omission was that *no native was admitted*

* 1910 (Cd. 5102, 9).

to give evidence. No evidence was admitted to show how the Gold Coast Concessions Ordinance had worked though witnesses thereon were available in England as well as in Africa. No missionary gave evidence—and a missionary may be a most important witness; for like a trader he knows the native and his ways and customs from an unofficial standpoint and he is independent of the Government in a way no official, and few trading agents, can be. Roman Catholic missionaries' evidence would have been valuable as in three cases they were vendors of land to the Niger Company* and they might have been asked from whom and how they acquired the land.

The Committee reported that the native has no "property" in the land he occupies. But I think I have shown that their decision must be accepted with some reserve. Even taking the evidence given, there is room for a different conclusion, viz., that the occupying cultivator had by custom undisturbed possession subject to some fine on alienation. Nor do I think it lies in the mouth of the British Government to deny the natives rights of property and alienation. The Niger Company from 1880 to 1900 bought from the natives various rights over land, freehold, leasehold, and easements, and in 1900 part of these rights they sold to the Government and part retained. If the natives had no right to alienate to the Niger Company, then the British Government have no title to these lands.

Further as the British Government bought in 1900 from the Niger Company land and rights over land which the Niger Company had originally acquired from natives, why should land now occupied by natives be taken and vested in the British Government by mere act of law. The assertion of "control" by the Government under the Proclamation of 1910 is not only technical, as they are enabled to take actual possession of any land if required, without payment for the land, but only for crops and improvements.

Lastly let us turn to the present situation. Mr. Belfield's report was published on or about July 12, 1912, but this official gentleman returned to England on May 14, 1912, and naturally he must have at once called at the Colonial Office; presumably he informed them of the general purport of his report, but

* Land and Native Right Proclamation. 1st Schedule Nos. 33, 34, 35.

to the Colonial Office only must it have been known. On June 6, 1912, there appeared in the *Times* *† a letter signed by Mr. E. D. Morel, Noel Buxton, J. Ramsay MacDonald, Philip Morrell, Albert Spicer and Josiah C. Wedgwood urging that the Northern Nigerian Land-system should be applied throughout West African Colonies and that an experienced committee should be appointed as was done in the case of Northern Nigeria. On the same June 6, 1912 a deputation including E. D. Morel, Mr. Wedgwood, P. Morrell, Mr. N. Buxton and Mr. King waited on Mr. L. Harcourt at the Colonial Office to urge that the Northern Nigeria system should be applied to the other West African Colonies. In the *Times* of June 26, 1912, there is an announcement that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has appointed a committee "to consider the laws relating to the transfer of land in the West African Colonies and Protectorates (other than Northern Nigeria) and to report whether any, and if so what, amendments of the law is required." The personnel of the Commission are Sir Kenelm E. Digby, G.C.B., K.C., Chairman; Sir F. M. Hodgson, K.C.M.G., Sir W. Taylor, K.C.M.G., Mr. J. C. Wedgwood, Mr. E. D. Morel with Mr. C. Strachey, Mr. W. D. Ellis and Mr. R. E. Stubbs at the Colonial Office. Out of these eight gentlemen three—Sir K. E. Digby, Mr. J. C. Wedgwood and Mr. C. Strachey, were members of the Northern Nigeria Committee of 1908. Mr. E. D. Morel and Mr. J. C. Wedgwood have avowed in the letter of June 6, 1912, their desire to introduce throughout West Africa the Northern Nigerian system and took part in the deputation. The remaining four members of the Committee are officials or ex-officials.

The inference seems obvious that the Colonial Office, who alone knew the purport of the Belfield Report published July 12, 1912, were not only the *Agent Provocateur* of the letter and deputation of June 6, 1912, but also by the appointment on June 26 of the Committee above named were determined to effect the throwing over of the Belfield Report and the introduction throughout West Africa of the Northern Nigerian system. Some, if not the majority, of the Committee had already prejudged the question submitted to them and announced their preference for the Northern Nigerian system.

* *Times*, June 6, p. 5. † *Ibid.* p. 7.

The arguments in favour of the Northern Nigerian system and its introduction elsewhere may be gathered from the report and evidence given before the Committee of 1908, Mr. E. D. Morel's articles in his paper, the *African Mail*, and the letter of June 6, 1912. They are twofold, *i.e.* that by nationalising the land, the introduction of freehold individual tenure which has already shown a tendency to creep in is prevented and the alleged communal system preserved and secondly the chiefs are stopped from improvidently alienating the tribal lands.

The first argument refers to native tenure and dealings between natives. It is a most difficult matter for European officials to understand, codify and administer native law and unless there is an imperative necessity, they had much better leave it alone. Why should not individual ownership come in Northern Nigeria, as it has come in elsewhere? Politically, a peasant proprietorship owing security of tenure to the British Government seems a valuable asset. Economically, to forbid by law the individual African ever becoming the owner of the land he occupies, removes the strongest inducement to thrift, good farming and development of the country. There are arguments in favour of land nationalisation and in particular of the nationalisation of mines, which it is not my task here to discuss. But in Europe, as a matter of practical politics, such nationalisation could only be carried out by compensation or recognition of existing vested rights unless as the result of a bloody civil war or revolution. In Northern Nigeria it has been effected not only without the consent but without consulting the natives and without any saving of vested interests. The arguments such as they are, in favour of land nationalisation, lose much of their force if it is to be thrust on the landsfolk at the behest and apparently for the benefit of an alien Power and its officials. Imagine land nationalisation in England carried out by a German conquest and the proceeds applied to the garrison and administration of the conquerors. To allow a communal native system with its give and take to continue or die out is far different from laying down by statute a hard and fast Government control administered by zealous officials.

The second argument is that by improvident alienations to Europeans of large areas and tribal land for a trifling consideration

the tribe will be deprived of their land and reduced—the phrase is Mr. Morel's—to a landless native proletariat.

Even assuming this to be either true in the present or a risk in the future, this is no reason for interfering with native land tenure and dealings between natives. But it is not true in the present and with any prudent legislative control over concessions there is no risk of the African being excluded from the soil by *latifundia*. Here we can come to bed-rock facts, the Belfield Report finds:

(*a*) Only one twenty-seventh of the Gold Coast and hardly any of Ashanti has been alienated to European concessionaries.

(*b*) There is over and above sufficient land for triple the present native population.

(*c*) The natives welcome the introduction of European concessionaries under proper conditions and their presence is beneficial to the natives.

The demand for concessions rightly granted cannot encroach seriously on the supply of land for the native. Each of these classes of concessions must surely be considered in a different light as to whether they are or are not exclusive of native rights of cultivation, of gathering natural produce, of hunting, &c.

(1) For a mining concession the exclusive surface rights required would extend to but a few acres for the shaft, erection of plant, houses for staff and labourers, dumping-ground and the right to cut timber for props and fuel. A mining concession might therefore be granted over a large area with but trifling interference with native rights. Suppose, to put an extreme case, the whole half-million square miles of British West Africa were parcelled out among various mining companies subject to forfeiture for non-working or non-payment of rent, would there be any material interference with the surface rights of the natives?

(2) A timber concession is not exclusive of native rights and according to Mr. Belfield's suggestion paragraphs 126 and 127 would be for five years only at a dead rent and royalty to remove mahogany ripe for cutting.

(3) Agricultural concessions for planting rubber, cocoa, &c., must of course be *pro tanto* exclusive of native rights. But if as Mr. Belfield suggests in paragraph 114 such a concession should be

not more than two square miles in a block and not more than two such areas held by the same person—it will be a very long time before the half-million square miles in British West Africa are planted up by European concessionaries. A grazing concession might be treated similarly to an agricultural concession, but up till now the European has manifested no wish to become a West African "Cattle Baron."

(4) A concession of gathering natural sylvan produce—oils, palms, gum, rubber, &c., should never be granted—see paragraphs 18 and 19 of Sir P. Girouard's despatch—as a monopoly and to the exclusion of the natives.

A common-sense purview of these facts as to European concessions drives one to the inference that the argument as to improvident alienation is so baseless, it can only be a pretext to cover some different object which the native, who is both shrewd and suspicious, has already perceived. The African objects, and naturally, that the control and disposition of his land should be vested in the Government and that he should become a rentpayer on a precarious tenure. If the Colonial Office have a cast iron policy they mean to enforce, it is open to them to carry it out. The natives are helpless and know they are helpless. At the most there will be some occasional village riot whereof the victims will be many score black men and some luckless British subaltern or sub-official. Is it the pretext to introduce the Indian Land Tax at 6s. in the Pound resulting in a population always near starvation limit? *

Cui Bono is the question to be asked as to the present proposal looked at with regard to the interests of the British Government, the natives and the European Concessionary.

The European Concessionary's interests are confined to dealings between natives and Europeans. He has no interest in dealings between natives and natives. He wants only a good merchantable indefeasible Government guaranteed title, which he can put and sell upon the Stock Exchange. He has to pay premiums and rent either to the Government or to the natives and *prima facie* it would seem immaterial to him who will be the payee. But the interest of the European concessionary is

* If there is a necessity for Direct Taxation, let it be on the profits of the European trader and concessionary as well as on native land, and at the same rate.

to live peaceably with the surrounding natives and obtain a good and constant supply of labour. That the native should be the payee will contribute to both these ends. The African is shrewd enough to appreciate the inexpediency of eating the gold-egg laying goose. If he perceives that the sequence of no labour and no profits for the concessionary means no rent to the native, it will surely conduce better to the peaceful development of the country than taxes and police.

The native accepts generally the theory that land dealings between natives and Europeans should be subject to external sanction, provided that he is the payee, and he prefers that the sanction should be judicial rather than executive.

Lastly, as to what is the most important dealing between natives and natives and native land tenure, *cui bono* the present proposals? Why can't they let it alone? To enact that the Government has control of the land is a pleonasm: the Government has the sovereignty and all the rights implied in sovereignty. Is it for the benefit of the British Government to thrust on the native proposals which, however well meant, are abhorrent to him? The native is neither a coward nor a fool, he is a shrewd trader. In the present instance all classes of native have combined to resist what they consider confiscation. To repeat the proverb quoted at Abeokuta and Ibadan, "When the lion drives people into the ditch it makes the people so driven friends, even if they were not friends before." Christian, Mohammedan and Pagan, coast and hinterland, educated and illiterate, have combined to defend their rights to the land against the Government. By evidence before the Committee, by public meeting, by the Press, unmistakably and unanimously the natives have declared their opposition. It was only after considerable pressure on the Colonial Office that it has been decided that though the present Committee will not go to Africa, evidence from native witnesses will be taken locally by the officials—a second best way of getting at the facts. Adverse evidence is being so tendered and further a deputation coming to England to oppose. Public Meetings of Protest have been held on the Gold Coast and Nigeria. The local Press is uncompromisingly hostile. There is the letter of well-reasoned criticism in the *Times* of July 18 by the deputation of the Gold Coast Society for whose *bona fides* Mr. Belfield vouches. The native

considers the present proposals a National Injustice, to force them on him will be a National Folly.

WILLIAM NEVILL M. GEARY.

P.S.—Northern Nigeria is excluded from the purview of the now sitting committee, but if the Gold Coast native dislikes the Northern Nigerian system, perhaps the Northern Nigerian native would like the present Gold Coast system; and they might, which has not yet been done, be consulted as to their wishes. In the Gold Coast system the European concessionary pays rent to the native, in Northern Nigeria the native pays rent to the European Government.

THE FUTURE OF JAPAN

"THE old order changeth." Not once alone, in her island-story, has Japan suffered transformation. It was a sea-change that the guns of Kagoshima and of Shimonoseki inaugurated fifty years ago, in the sequel of Perry's historic parley with the Tycoon of Yedo. Hardly less profound was the transforming influence of the Manchurian War, when Japan first taught the East to confront in arms the o'erleaping West. But there is no reason to believe that the evolutionary process is, for Japan, at an end. Dai Nippon is once more passing through the fire of shifting circumstance that her work may be tried, of what sort it is. Great changes are on foot in the national life and character; and the effects of these upon the national policy, like coming events, cast their shadows before.

The succession of the era of Tai-sho to that of Meiji implies something more than a case of *Le Roi est mort: vive le Roi.* Mutsuhito, Imperial link between the Old Japan and the New, has indeed been gathered to his fathers. But the statesmen-makers of the New Japan have also been reduced by the Reaper to a feeble few. And to join, on "the other side," the assembled shades of the faithful retainers of Meiji Tenno, from Ito and Okubo to Nogi, is slowly but surely passing another ghostly form—the spirit of Old Japan.

Of the changes which distinguished the bygone era, not a few, imposed upon the nation from without, were the products of *force majeure*. Others, also from extraneous sources, the Japanese deemed it advisable to adopt in the interests of national advancement or of self-defence. All these Japan may be said to have put on like so many garments and, were she so minded, she could, with no great difficulty, divest herself of them. But the revolution now afoot in the Island Empire differs in kind

from all that have gone before. It is one of thought and outlook and character. In part, no doubt—like much beside in Japanese life—it may have been officially inspired; but none the less it is a national movement. The Japanese people are revising their articles of faith, and the effect of this spiritual regeneration upon their future growth and policy cannot but be profound.

To no man living, outside of the nation itself, is the Japanese character an open book. Even so sympathetic an observer as Lafcadio Hearn, who may be said to have devoted, *con amore*, a lifetime to its study, confessed in the end that the Japanese mind remained to him an enigma. No doubt the difficulty of arriving at a true estimate is increased by the fact that even the sympathetic investigator soon finds himself up against the dead wall of Oriental inscrutability. At times of national crisis the success with which the Japanese people have concealed their feelings from the outside world has been remarked by foreigners resident in their midst. Some observers maintain that this national dissimulation is dictated solely by considerations of expediency; but influential Japanese have been known to declare, in moments of candour, that ability to don the mask constitutes a useful, as well as a fundamental, trait of the national character.

Whether this taciturnity be studied or instinctive, it has not prevented the recognition of certain outstanding characteristics as having played a decisive part in the moulding of the national life. Seeing that the Japanese character is now in a state of flux, it will be pertinent to inquire to what extent the ancient springs of action are being supplanted by others new and strange.

Loyalty to the throne, with its supernatural or deistic side, and the practice of ancestor-worship, closely allied therewith, have always ranked high among the motives of the Japanese polity. To these, exalting, as they do, the kindred ideals of the family and the State, and inculcated as they have been from the earliest years, may justly be attributed such achievements of the Japanese people as have called for self-sacrificing patriotism, courage in the field and a disregard of death approaching the sublime. Nevertheless, the fact remains that intercourse with the West, the consequent growth of the democratic idea and the framing of legal codes on the basis of the individual rather than on that of the family are weakening these fundamental principles

of Japanese life. Perhaps no more convincing evidence of this tendency could be adduced than the efforts of the late Katsura Ministry to counteract it by making ancestor-worship at the nearest Shinto shrine compulsory in every elementary school throughout the Empire—a proceeding objected to by Christian and other propagandists as an infringement of that clause of the Constitution which guarantees freedom of religious belief and practice. The spread of Socialistic doctrines in recent years—a process which, if secret, is none the less substantial—has also reacted unfavourably on the old and sedulously preserved conception of the kingly state. Such a plot as that against the life of Mutsuhito two years ago would have been unthinkable in the Japan of a generation back. There is no product of Occidental civilisation which the Japanese authorities view with greater apprehension or whose manifestations they visit with greater severity; but, despite heroic measures of repression, the Socialist cancer spreads.

Pari passu with this loss of reverential regard for the Sovereign—and, perhaps, in some measure accounting for it—there has to be recorded a perceptible diminution of the religious sense. The State religion, Shinto, takes no account of futurity, and offers, therefore, but little attraction for a people who believe that the summit of their greatness has yet to be reached. Buddhism, on the other hand, which does take thought for the morrow, flourishes chiefly among the lower classes, where it is looked upon rather as securing for its devotees successful harvests, deliverance from sickness and other like material benefits in this life. Christianity—*pace* numerous missionaries of sects almost as numerous who preach it—makes little headway, and a conference of missionary bodies was recently summoned for the purpose of inquiring into the causes of its apparent failure. Adverse forces, making more or less directly for irreligion, are also at work; and such predilections as the Japanese may possess for religion of any kind are being stifled by the dissemination of atheism in the less ugly guise of "rationalism." The alarming vogue of suicide—especially among the student class—may not unjustly be attributed to the spiritual confusion and darkness in which the whole nation walks.

That this grave change has been recognised by the most paternal of governments, and has been recognised as a change for

the worse, is shown by the official attempt within the past twelve months to establish a new, composite and generally acceptable religion. Though the attempt failed, the mere fact that it was made is eloquent. Thinking Japanese perceive that something is wanting in the national life; and with a *naïveté* which has its pathetic side they looked to an artificially constructed religion to make good the deficiency. Perhaps the secret of the failure lay here: that the new amalgam of creeds was viewed frankly as a means to material ends—such as the avoidance of conflicts between capital and labour; the promotion of the "interests of the community" and the "welfare of the State"—a far cry indeed from the ideal of Him who bade would-be disciples leave all and follow Him.

If Japanese officialdom, in its efforts for the spiritual betterment of the nation, cannot keep the material out of its purview, no more can the nation itself. Where, in bygone days, commercialism dared not lift its head, it now proves an all-engrossing creed. Like Mammon in Heaven, the multitude in Japan—as in the West—has come to admire more the riches of the path it treads than "aught divine or holy else." Doubtless it was as a protest against this tendency of the age that the veteran General Nogi desired his self-immolation on the occasion of the Meiji obsequies to be construed. The ancient feudal custom of *junshi* (suicide of a retainer on the death of his lord as a proof of loyalty and devotion), legally obviated by its modern counterpart, the use of *haniwa* (effigies buried with the deceased), may have supplied the simple old warrior with a text; but dissatisfaction with the trend of the national life was the burden of his eloquent, if wordless, homily. Nogi's sacrifice, however, profoundly though it impressed his countrymen at the time, was but a voice crying in the wilderness. The creed of the *Bushi* may have been, in its palmiest days, the guiding star of the Japanese people. To-day, even among their descendants, it is a spent force. The sword was once "the soul of the *samurai*," but its place has been taken by the *soroban*.*

However, the belief of the leaders of Japanese thought in the national capacity for assimilation is illimitable. To have fallen into line with the West in politics, commerce and art is not enough.

* The Japanese abacus.

The remarkable imitative ability of the Japanese is now being invoked on behalf of its social and moral codes; and the whole fabric of Japanese society is being subverted by the officially inspired cult of conventionality. "Do as the Romans do," is the instruction of the classes to the masses, without the excuse of being "in Rome." From time immemorial the people have been accustomed to look upon the fundamental problems of life in a spirit of natural, almost idyllic, simplicity. They are now altering their whole attitude towards these questions, at the instance of the official class.

From time to time, some influential newspaper, inspired by this or that member of the Government, engineers a crusade against such peculiarly national institutions as the Geisha and the Yoshiwara, on the ground that these are social solecisms, contrary to "the interests of the State." The Japanese Scotland Yard, undertaking the education of the people in matters of sexual propriety, insists upon the erection of wooden partitions across the large tanks in the public bath-houses, though, in many of the remoter rural districts, the placing of a bamboo pole athwart the surface of the water is deemed sufficient. Innate innocence is thus supplanted by the suggestion of evil where, *per se*, none exists.

The effect upon the rising generation of these official methods of inculcating ethics—if one may judge by the state of morality among the student-class in Tokyo and other large centres—is precisely what may have been expected.

In general, it may be said that Japan, having reproduced in an Oriental environment—with remarkable ease and on the whole with success—the material part of the civilisation of the West, is now applying herself with characteristic thoroughness to the assimilation of its social and ethical side. In other words, the national character is undergoing a forced and unnatural reconstruction at the instance of external agencies acting through official channels. In a gigantic and complex operation of this kind, if the result is not to be disaster, the supreme question is that of the motive. Are the Japanese exchanging their views and ways of life for the views and ways of an alien civilisation because those are wrong and these are right, or are they guided merely by considerations of expediency? Does the reformation (if such it be) spring from

sincere repentance or has it a less noble and more material origin? Since national greatness knows no other foundation than that of national character, how will the change in the one affect the other? These are the queries which the student of affairs cannot refrain from asking when confronted with this unique drama of national evolution. Nor can he be blamed if he contemplates the outcome with some misgiving.

In the domain of politics, the new era, for some years to come at least, promises to be distinguished by a feature quite foreign to the old. The desire of the Japanese people is for a period of retrenchment, destitute—if circumstances permit—of any species of adventure. Whether the bureaucratic or militarist element will suffer its realisation remains to be seen. The fact is that for a quarter of a century—and all too hastily, in the opinion of some—Japan has pursued the path of expansion. It has brought her glory, but at enormous cost. She is still paying in hard cash for her exploits by land and sea. The recovery from the *post bellum* depression was neither so easy nor so rapid as her rulers expected; and even with a war-tax which has become a permanent impost, the yearly balancing of her Budget is a task of great difficulty. In view of these circumstances, the almost invariable optimism of Japanese writers and publicists has of late given place to a somewhat chastened mood in dealing with the outlook for the future. It is asked whether Japan did not reach her zenith in 1905, whether her people were not screwed up by the triumphs of the war to a pitch of elation which they are unable to maintain; and the elder statesmen are blamed for keeping things too much in their hands and failing to prepare the people for the time when they would be as sheep without a shepherd. That this movement has not been without effect may be inferred from the first important event of the new reign—the struggle over the proposed increase of the land forces of the Empire by two divisions, on the score of increased responsibilities entailed by the annexation of Korea. The materialistic spirit, in so far as it is identified with commercialism, makes for peace: war is a waste, a set-back. But the militarists have for the moment gained the upper hand; and the world will witness the strange spectacle of a bureaucracy pursuing a policy at variance with the will of the bulk of the nation. The next few

years promise to be eventful whether the Japanese people wish it or no.

With regard to the relations between Japan and this country there are reasons for believing that the next few years will be marked, not indeed by conflicting aims, but by a diminution of common interests, arising out of the changed conditions in Eastern Asia. The Alliance in its present form has not in Japanese eyes the same value as that of 1905. In the matter of Anglo-Japanese relations the foreign communities resident in Japan represent a small, but persistently adverse, influence. It is a curious fact that the only advocates Japan can find in the Press in that part of the world are those whom she has captured—or (as the Trans-Atlantic idiom has it) "nobbled"—for that express purpose. While this circumstance is usually construed in a sense unfavourable to the Japanese, it may with equal reason be taken as showing to how large an extent prejudice enters into the attitude of the representatives of Western commercialism in the Far East.

In the impending great development of the Pacific area, the continuance of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance till 1921 will be of great value in ensuring the friendliness of Japanese relations with Western Canada, on the one hand, and with Australia, on the other. In the former direction, no recrudescence of trouble need be expected, as the tide of immigration into British Columbia has, with the co-operation of the Japanese Government, been effectively diverted elsewhere. Australian apprehensions—based apparently on the assumption that the ill-developed Northern Territory offers an irresistible temptation to an enterprising enemy —are as uncomplimentary to the Japanese as our allies as to the defensive capacity of the British Empire. As matters now stand they have but the slenderest foundation in fact; as time goes on they will have less.

The opening of the Panama Canal can scarcely fail to have the effect of imparting a certain intensity to the relations between Japan and the United States. What the nature of those relations will be will depend on the extent to which the State Department attempts to give effect to the pronouncement of Mr. Secretary Knox in 1910, that "the Far East is part of the problem of the Pacific," and that the United States "views with disfavour any extension of Japanese territorial influence in the outlying portions of the

Chinese Empire." Fortunately for the peace of the Orient, the Japanese are not an emotional people, liable to be swayed by sudden gusts of emotion. If they cannot include among their national assets newspaper "kings" who can "make" wars, they possess rulers who manifest in a special degree the shrewd and far-seeing qualities that go to make up wise statesmanship. In all potential sources of friction the Japanese may be trusted to maintain a strictly defensive attitude. Concentration, not dissipation, has always been the watchword of Japan's strategy. That principle is all against the policy of adventure with which she is so frequently credited.

The future of Japan is, for good or ill, bound up with that of China—and none the less so because the rise of the Chinese Republic promises to transform the face of the Far East. Nature designed Japan an insular, circumstance has made her a continental, Power. It was the Chinese question that brought Russia and Japan together—first in conflict, and then in an *entente*. As neighbours of one another and of the Middle Kingdom, these two Powers have interests and aims more vital and direct than those of any other Power. The brain of Ito has been credited with the idea of a "Three Empire League," composed of the Russian, British and Japanese Empires, which should exert a deciding influence upon the fate of China. The mantle of Ito has indeed descended upon Katsura; but whereas Ito reckoned upon a decrepit and helpless China, Katsura found a China which, so far from being ready for dissection, gives promise of a renewed and vigorous youth. Russia's object in this direction—of which her recent action in Outer Mongolia gives further proof—is to make of her Trans-Siberian system a path to Peking which, for no part of its course, would pass through territory dominated by another Power. Nevertheless the question of Inner Mongolia remains, and seems destined to prove a veritable bone of contention among the three Powers most nearly concerned. As the converging point of so many ambitions, Peking bids fair to become the Constantinople of the Far East. There is more wisdom than may at first sight appear in the suggestion of the Republican leaders that the capital of New China should be some centrally situated city, further removed from a frontier already dominated by two Great Powers.

"China," said one of the most distinguished of Japanese

publicists, not long ago, "is the true field for Japanese expansion in the future." The dictum was probably suggested by the hoisting of the Pacific Coast placard, "No Japanese wanted here"; but its truth is founded upon profounder and more potent considerations, arising out of geographical, climatic, and racial conditions. Up till quite recent times, the two countries were separated by stormy, if narrow, seas and by the territory of a quasi-independent State. It is now but a step from Liaotung to Pechili; and the relations between the two branches of the Yellow Race increase daily in importance and intimacy. The climate of central and southern China also makes a strong appeal to the average Japanese settler, who abhors cold weather. The Tokyo Government experiences great difficulty in finding the *personnel* for its elaborate colonisation schemes in its own Hokkaido because of the severity of the winters there encountered; and, for a similar reason, neither Manchuria nor Korea—with the exception of the Fusan-Mokpo district—provides a wholly satisfactory outlet for the surplus Japanese population. "To the South!" is the cry of a people only one-eighth of whose land is cultivable, while in the entire northern half of it they do not get their fair share of the sun they love. Prior to the startling developments nearer home during the past twelve months it was a common thing for Japanese publicists and writers in the Press to direct the attention of their countrymen, on the score of climatic amenity, to the Dutch East Indies and the Kingdom of Siam, as eminently suitable fields for their enterprise.

In matters of policy, of late years, Japanese statesmen have been wisely listening to "the call of the blood." By skill and moderation in diplomatic debate they have reduced to vanishing point the differences between the two countries. *Pace* the popular belief to that effect, the Japanese position in Manchuria does not of itself constitute a bar to friendly relations with China. The Chinese recognise that, in resisting the advance of Russia, Japan was fighting their battle as well as her own; that, were it not for the stricken field of Mukden and the unquenchable heroism of Nogi at Port Arthur, Russia would be where Japan is now; and that the position of Japan in South Manchuria is but a small return for her own enormous sacrifice of blood and treasure and for the untold service she has rendered to the East. There is,

therefore, no bitterness between the two peoples on this, or indeed on any, score. Increased intercourse, on the contrary, is producing a better understanding, based on mutual knowledge and respect. The Japanese "man in the street," who was wont to entertain for his Celestial brother a certain measure of contempt, has begun to realise that the Chinaman, if less martial, is a better man of business than himself. Since the war, upwards of eight thousand Chinese students have completed their education in the Higher Schools of Tokyo and Kyoto, and many of these, profoundly impressed by the progress made by their neighbour in the arts of peace and war, have returned to play their part in urging their own countrymen to a new way of life—which, in its essence, is Japan's way of life. As to the change in the form of government in China, while the Japanese authorities would have preferred, for reasons already suggested, that even the shadow of a monarchy had been retained, popular sympathy in Japan was on the side of the revolutionists. The Japanese as a whole, official and unofficial, would have preferred—and still prefer—anything to that last of all calamities—the partition of China among the Powers of the West.

The real revolution that has taken place in China—and it is one with which Japan, from the lessons of her own history, is in the fullest sympathy—is the recognition of the fundamental value of material strength. The nation in whose eyes the profession of the soldier ever ranked the lowest has learned that, for her own security, she must call her sons to arms. In preparing herself for self-support and self-defence China will need assistance. For this, as surely as the flower turns towards the sun, she will turn to Japan. Already Chinese warships are being built in Japanese yards; and Japanese officers are engaged in the organisation of Chinese land forces. Already Chinese papers are urging that important works of development in connection with mines and railways should be entrusted to Japanese rather than to foreign experts. And when the hour strikes for the Middle Kingdom to shuffle off the toils of Western tutelage, the opportunity for which the more virile section of the Yellow Race is waiting will have arrived.

For that supreme moment in the history of the East the Japanese, on their part, are preparing. In a sense, Japan needs

China more than China needs Japan. China's immensity, her vast reserves of man-power, will render her valuable as an ally, formidable as a foe. While China's immediate needs are military rather than commercial, Japan's are commercial rather than military. The two nations will therefore serve as complements the one of the other. Just as the Japanese look to the development of their trade with China—and with the Yangtse Valley in particular—to furnish the sinews of economic strength, the Chinese are looking to the Japanese to lay wide and deep the foundation of their military strength and teach them the once despised, but now essential, art of war.

No doubt the bare suggestion of an offensive and defensive alliance between the Chinese and Japanese Empires as one of the probabilities of the near future will suffice to conjure up in many minds that still uninterred bogey, the "Yellow Peril." The simple fact that the two great branches of the Mongolian race muster between them a third of the world's population can be made to acquire, on paper, a most portentous look; and—in the view of certain imaginative publicists, among whom history includes a Royal orator—has bred visions of yellow hordes innumerable pouring from the East on to the plains of Europe, to launch humanity upon an Armageddon of race and colour in which sheer weight of numbers prevails. Of this, however, the world may rest assured—that if the "Yellow Peril" ever materialises in the shape, or anything like the shape, its exponents assign to it, the responsibility for the ensuing cataclysm must be laid at the door of the West, and of the representatives of its civilisation in the East. Aggressiveness—the chief attribute of the West in its dealings with the East—is utterly foreign to the Chinese character; prudence is the key-note of the Japanese. The union—one might almost say, the fusion—of the two races is inevitable; but only a keen and unquenchable sense of resentment—the memory either of material wrongs inflicted, or of accumulated insult endured—can ever arm the East against the West, or precipitate a War of Hemispheres.

E. Bruce Mitford.



SCOTTISH SHIP CANAL (FORTH AND CLYDE DIRECT ROUTE)

THE MID-SCOTLAND SHIP CANAL

(GLASGOW AND THE DIRECT ROUTE)

THERE is now such a volume of opinion from all quarters in favour of a Scottish Ship Canal from the Forth to the Clyde at sea-level, deep enough for ships of the largest class, that the question may be said to have passed beyond its initial stage, and to have entered upon the second stage, of which is the best route for the Canal to take. The promotion of the Canal has been so much accelerated by the Mid-Scotland Ship Canal Association, under the patriotic guidance of the late Admiral Sir Charles Campbell, that it is important to know what was the conclusion arrived at by this Association upon the question.

In May 1911, a special meeting of the Association was held in the Royal United Service Institution, London, when the Duke of Sutherland, the President of the Association, occupied the Chair, and a resolution in favour of the Direct Route was unanimously arrived at, settling the question so far as the Association was concerned. After recording its deep sense of the great loss sustained by all interested in a Ship Canal, through the death of Admiral Sir Charles Campbell, who had given such loyal and devoted services for so many years, the resolution proceeds:

> Considering it is essential to the project of a Ship Canal from the Forth to the Clyde, that the promoters should unite upon one route, and having heard explanations this meeting agrees to promote the Direct Route at sea-level, from Grangemouth to Yoker, and that the commercial and strategic advantages of this route be pressed upon his Majesty's Government.

This movement in favour of the Direct Route was supported by Glasgow and the West of Scotland, and we may usefully inquire why Glasgow has given its unswerving support to it for over one hundred years.

In the reign of Queen Anne, Daniel Defoe wrote that a canal between the Forth and Clyde would be "to the great advancement of the commerce of the whole island." At the union of England and Scotland, there was much talk of forming such a canal, which no doubt gave inspiration to the promoters of the Barge Canal, which at present winds along the Kelvin Valley, linking up the Forth to Glasgow and the Clyde. It is interesting to note that when the question of the line to be taken came before the engineers, who made the first survey in 1723, it was urged, as has been urged to-day, that the Canal should proceed along the easy Forth Valley into Loch Lomond. The advice of Smeaton, the most eminent canal engineer then living, was taken, and he strongly recommended the Direct Route along the Kelvin Valley in preference to the Loch Lomond Route. The Direct Route was accordingly adopted, and the Barge Canal was formed along that valley in the year 1790 entering the Clyde at Bowling.

The Barge Canal is only 10 ft. in depth, but it was considered of such importance at the time to Glasgow and the West of Scotland that although the city had only a population of 31,000, the Corporation, in these quaint words, subscribed £1000 towards making the Canal:

Glasgow, 5th of Febrarie 1767 years. The Magestrates and Councillors conveemed, authorise the Lord Provost, in their name, and behoove of the community of this City, to subscribe the sum of £1000 sterling, towards defraying the expence of making a Canal, or cutt, betwixt the Carran shoar (Forth) to the City near to the Broamlew (Clyde).

The second city of the Empire has now a population of over 1,000,000, with huge shipping interests, undreamt of by the worthy Provost and Bailies of one hundred and forty-five years ago, but Glasgow's interest in a waterway from the Forth to the Clyde has increased rather than diminished.

It is not difficult to see how Smeaton strongly recommended the Direct Route as against the Loch Lomond Route. If Scotland were a desert island, looked at from the clouds, the green Forth Valley and blue Loch Lomond would be an ideal cut from sea to sea, but when population, towns, minerals, industries, shipping and commerce have to be considered, the pastoral valley gives way to the industrial one. No doubt Smeaton considered the Direct Route more difficult to make, but his far-seeing mind realised

that the difficulties were outweighed by the advantages, and that an easy cut was not the chief consideration. The Forth Valley Route passes through agricultural country without minerals, manufactures or towns, and with a sparse population, and at no point is it closer than fifteen miles to the Glasgow Royal Exchange. The present Barge Canal passes along the industrial Kelvin Valley, rich in coal and iron, and closely connected with coal, iron, oil, and many other industries. Dotted along the line are the towns of Falkirk, Carron, Larbert, Denny, Bonnybridge, Cumbernauld, Kilsyth, Kirkintilloch, Milton, Torrance, Milngavie, Maryhill, and finally Glasgow—the length being twenty-nine miles against fifty-one miles via Loch Lomond.

Mr. Smeaton's advice was amply justified by results. During the hundred years following its formation, the revenue of the Barge Canal rose from £22,000 to £145,000 per annum, and is now considerably over that. Unfortunately for the public, the Barge Canal was acquired by the Caledonian Railway Company forty-five years ago, and there is no sign of its being deepened or widened.

Its success has not been lost sight of by the Glasgow public, and in 1891, under the able guidance of Mr. J. Law Crawford, Secretary to a Provisional Committee of promoters, a strong effort was made to have a ship canal formed, practically along the Direct Route of the Barge Canal. The views of this Committee suffered from financial constriction, limiting their horizon to a cost of £6,000,000, and this dealt two heavy blows at their scheme. They were unable to put forward a project for a sea-level canal, because of the cost of the heavy cutting, and consequently their project included no less than twelve locks, necessary to raise ships from the sea-level to the canal-level. Mr. Law Crawford's Committee did excellent public service in breaking up the ground for a ship canal, but the project, mainly owing to the numerous locks, was coldly received. It was not until important naval strategic considerations aroused public attention in 1900 that the value of such a ship canal came to be realised.

We owe much to the late Admiral Sir Charles Campbell, whose eye looking at the map of our little kingdom saw the value of a waterway across its narrowest part, and with patriotic

enthusiasm, for which he deserves the highest praise, devoted the remainder of his life, and the utmost of his failing strength, to pressing upon his countrymen the importance of the idea. At first he advocated the Loch Lomond Route, on the assumption that the Direct Route was impossible "owing to the twelve locks." But when it was demonstrated to him that the Direct Route *at sea-level* was possible, he accepted the changed conditions. At the same time his main idea was, "give me a ship canal by any route you please, so that you give me a canal, and give it soon." Among others who accepted the changed conditions were the veteran strategist, Lord Kingsborough, Lord Blythswood, and the Duke of Argyll, who coined the phrase that the Canal would be "a back door to Rosyth."

In the year 1909 Admiral Sir Charles Campbell visited Glasgow as a missionary of the Canal, and the result was the formation of a strong Glasgow branch of the Association, under the Chairmanship of his intimate friend, Mr. Arthur Kay, who has rendered important service to the cause in the West of Scotland. One of the first results was the enrolment of more than one-half of the Glasgow town councillors as members of the Association, and the acceptance of the positions of office-bearers by several of the magistrates.

It soon became apparent to the working executive that Glasgow had not left her old love, and that the Corporation and the community would not support any other than the Direct Route for the Canal unless and until it was demonstrated beyond doubt that a ship canal at sea-level along that route was an engineering impossibility.

As showing Glasgow's living interest in the movement, in 1908, on the motion of Bailie Ure, the Corporation adopted a resolution to memorialise the Government in favour of "A *direct* navigable channel between the North Sea and the Atlantic, which would be advantageous to the State and to the commerce of the country." At a later stage, the Corporation appointed Bailie Bruce Murray and Bailie Ure to give evidence on behalf of Glasgow before the Royal Commission on Canals and Waterways. This they did the following year, speaking not only as town councillors, but the one as a shipowner and the other as an ironfounder, in favour of the Direct Route and its great advantages

to the trade and commerce of the towns along the Kelvin Valley, and to Glasgow and the West of Scotland.

Meanwhile the Glasgow Executive instituted a thorough inquiry as to the possibility or impossibility of cutting a sea-level canal by the Direct Route, gathering all the facts they could obtain. The first important fact practically disposed of the whole matter. It was that the making of a sea-level canal by the Direct Route was not a question of the possible or the impossible—all the engineers smiled at that idea—it was only one of expense. There was nothing which the engineers could not overcome if they were paid for it. Mr. Stevenson, the engineer who advocated the Loch Lomond Route, and Mr. Hogg, who advocated the Direct Route, were both at one upon that point. They were also in agreement that the Direct Route had commercial advantages to Glasgow and the towns in the Kelvin Valley over that of the Loch Lomond Route. They were not in agreement, however, as to the difference of cost between the two routes, Mr. Hogg being of opinion that £3,000,000 would amply cover that difference.

In the autumn of 1910 Mr. Arthur Kay, as Chairman of the Glasgow branch, put the situation in Glasgow before Admiral Sir Charles Campbell in a communication, afterwards printed, which had an effect upon the Admiral's mind. In it he said:

> The feeling of a city, like Glasgow cannot be guaged by meetings. It must be gradually measured by studying the views of the leading commercial men, and it is pretty clear that the Loch Lomond Route will receive no moral support, much less material support, if as people believe, the direct route is practicable. This must be faced, fought, disproved or admitted. The engineer of Glasgow Corporation looks favourably upon the Direct Route, and the men with practical knowledge of the River Clyde are convinced that the Channel presents no insuperable difficulties. The Admiralty seemed to condemn the Direct Route because it was presented to them with twelve locks. What would their view have been of a *direct sea-level canal with only one sea lock at each end?*

The concluding words had reference to the report of the Canal Commissioners in 1909, who favoured the Loch Lomond Route as against the Direct Route with locks. Mr. Kay concluded by inviting Admiral Sir Charles Campbell, if his health would permit, to attend a conference in Glasgow, at which the engineers for both routes would be present, when conflicting views could be threshed out, and concentration upon one route brought about.

This conference was held in the spring of 1911, but Admiral Sir Charles Campbell was not well enough to come, and Lord Blythswood attended in his place as representing the London Association. A series of fourteen carefully prepared questions, dealing with the important points connected with a ship canal, were submitted to the conference, which included the engineers of the two routes, and were candidly answered. The result conclusively settled what has been already mentioned, that the Direct Route presented no insuperable engineering difficulties, and its commercial advantages were greater than the Loch Lomond Route. The difference of cost was mentioned as inside £3,000,000. The conference unanimously agreed to recommend the Direct Route at sea-level as the best. This decision was afterwards confirmed at a special meeting of members in Glasgow, and received the unanimous approval of the Glasgow Press, and formed the basis for the resolution of union upon the Direct Route arrived at by the General Association in London in May 1911.

The interest of Glasgow Corporation in the Direct Route at sea-level became closer. In the winter of 1911 the Corporation appointed a special Canal Committee of eighteen councillors, with Bailie Ure as chairman, with these instructions: "In view of the increasing importance of establishing navigation between the Forth and Clyde via the Direct Route for vessels of the largest size, it is remitted to this Committee to report what steps should be taken in the matter, in the interests of the city."

The Committee was reappointed in November last, and has been in communication with members of the Government and Parliament, of whom a number are menbers of the Ship Canal Association.

The route of the Direct Canal, which has been frequently surveyed, may be briefly described as commencing with a canting basin, with openings both up and down the River Clyde. Leaving the Clyde about Yoker, opposite to the large Dreadnought Dock, presently being constructed by the Clyde trustees, the Canal would pass through soft low land, following the line of a burn, and coming close to the existing old Barge Canal, between the Forth and Clyde. Near Cannisburn the ground

rises, to about 160 ft. above sea-level, which would necessitate deep cutting, and then the Canal would pass into the Kelvin Valley about Garscube, the ground sinking to about 110 ft. above sea-level. Following the line of the Kelvin Valley Railway, it would pass close on the north side of the town of Kirkintilloch, and close on the south side of the town of Kilsyth, the ground reaching its highest level at Kelvinhead. For thirteen miles the level varies from 100 to 160 ft. above the sea, which covers the heaviest portion of the cutting along the whole route. From Kelvinhead the Canal would pass Banknock, and proceed down the valley of the Bonny Water, keeping to the north of the town of Bonnybridge, where the level is about 120 ft. above the sea, and thence onward to the junction of the Bonny Water and the River Carron. Thus the level gradually sinks until within six miles of the town of Grangemouth, the Canal proceeding through flat country and entering the Forth at the mouth of the Carron River, near to the Beacon Lighthouse. The cutting at the Clyde end would principally be through sandstone rock, the rest probably being through gravel and glacial drift, with a short portion of whinstone. Geologists say that at one time the sea flowed through the Kelvin Valley, cutting Scotland in two. The deep cutting necessary at the high land to make the Canal at sea-level presents no features of special difficulty, and is a question of expense only.

The route touches the municipal boundary of Glasgow within four miles of the Royal Exchange, and it has been suggested that the value of the Canal to Glasgow would be greatly enhanced by a series of docks formed in the low-lying land of Possil, north of the city. This could be achieved by a slight diversion of the main route, and would bring these docks to within two and a half miles of Glasgow Royal Exchange. There are large engineering and other industries at that part of the city, and ships loading there could proceed either to the Atlantic via the Clyde, or to the continental and Baltic ports via the Forth. These docks, however, are not in any way vital to the project of the Canal, and would fall within the province of the Clyde trustees, but they serve to indicate the immense possibilities of the Direct Route.

It has been questioned whether the River Clyde could carry the immense increase of traffic which the Direct Route Canal

would create. This is a welcome admission that the increase would be great, but the suggestion of congestion of shipping in the river is a mere bogey. The Glasgow Executive included this among their investigations and obtained the opinion of two of the largest shipping lines in Glasgow, who concurred in saying that the Clyde just now could carry four times its present traffic without congestion.

The Clyde Trustees are engaged in deepening the Clyde to a depth of 27 ft. at low water, and this may have to be increased if they are to adequately serve the Dreadnought Dock under construction at Renfrew. The depth required by the canal is 36 ft., and there can be no doubt that the authorities who turned a fishing stream into a great ocean waterway, could safely be left to go 9 ft. deeper if the necessity should arise.

It has been said that such a deep channel would bring down the dock walls at Greenock, but if the cutting were taken off the opposite side of the Channel, leaving the Greenock side untouched, there could be no such result. If necessary, at a cost of £650,000, the old river channel between the Cockle Bank and the Pillar Bank could be dredged out to form an open way for large vessels, leaving the present channel untouched. This channel would eliminate the dangerous Garvel point from Clyde navigation, an improvement which would be welcomed by all who use the river.

The question of locks has an important bearing on the speed and safety of vessels using the canal. The Loch Lomond Route would require to be made at the level of Loch Lomond, which is 22 ft. above the sea, necessitating at each end, one lock at high water, and two at low water, with a lift ranging from 17 to 27 ft. at the Clyde, and 13 to 31 ft. at the Forth, the sea-level at the Forth being 4 to 5 ft. higher than at the Clyde. It would also have entrances and exits at Grangemouth, Endrick, Tarbet, and Arrochar, an element of danger to ships in windy weather.

The Direct Route can be made *at sea-level*, as it has not to accommodate itself to the level of an inland loch, and would have a single entrance at the Forth and at the Clyde ends. There would be one sea lock at each end, with lifts ranging from 4 to 14 ft. at the Clyde, and from 0 ft. to 18 ft. at the Forth, where at high water and spring tides the sea lock could stand open and ships sail in and out without interruption.

By the Direct Route a ship would pass from Grangemouth to Yoker in from 4½ to 4¾ hours, according as it used one or two locks. By the Loch Lomond Route it would take from 10 to 10½ hours to reach the same point of the Clyde, or 8 hours from salt water to salt water.

By the Direct Route the distances saved between Glasgow and the home and foreign ports, with which Glasgow does a large trade, are very striking.

From Glasgow to Hull, the distance saved would be 626 miles, Dundee 434 miles, London 271 miles, Hamburg 487 miles. The advantage would be shared by Liverpool, which should save on a passage to Shields 333 miles, and Dundee 318 miles. Belfast, too, would save on a passage to Hull 298 miles, to Dundee 204 miles, to London 100 miles. From Hamburg to New York the saving would be 300 miles.

No one can speak to a mariner about the dangers of the passage round Scotland by the Pentland Firth in winter time, with its treacherous currents and threatening shores, without being told that a canal which would render this passage unnecessary would be a great boon to shipmasters as well as shipowners. The saving in insurance would be considerable.

The Direct sea-level canal would have a floor width of 138 ft., and a depth of 36 ft. at all states of the tide to meet Admiralty requirements, and it is natural that the Government which lays down these dimensions should be expected to help to dig the canal. The engineers for the Direct Route estimate the cost at £24,000,000, and it is proposed that the Government should guarantee interest at 3 per cent. on the cost, and the money would be forthcoming. It would be required gradually, as the work proceeded, and by the time the whole sum was taken up the canal would be earning a revenue from dues on shipping which would be applied towards meeting the Government guarantee. As the revenue grew the guarantee would diminish until it ceased altogether. The Manchester Ship Canal, which is not a through-going waterway, multiplied its revenue fivefold in fifteen years. The revenue of the Clyde Trust is increasing every year, and is now close on £600,000 per annum, while the shipbuilding on the Clyde represents one-fifth of the whole world. The Government guarantee would come to

about one-half of what it at present receives in revenue from the Suez Canal shares. Such a guarantee for a great national project is nothing new. The Government has guaranteed £100,000,000 for land purchase in Ireland, and it does not seem extravagant for Scotch members with some patriotic grit to ask a guarantee of £24,000,000 for Scotland to make a ship canal, which would commercially benefit not Scotland alone but the whole United Kingdom, and be a source of security to the Empire.

It has been said that in three years the Direct Route Canal could be made sufficient to float "Dreadnoughts" by the "back door" of Rosyth to the greatest shipbuilding and ship-repairing centre in the world, leaving the completion of the Canal for commerce to a later date. Canal construction has advanced with gigantic strides, and the record of the Panama Canal made in eight years leaves the impression that cutting a Scottish Ship Canal through an engineering centre, with iron, coal, and labour close at hand, would be regarded by the giants of engineering as a very modest undertaking.

The strategic advantages of such a canal have been ably dealt with by Commander Currey in the November number of the *National Review*. It is obvious that every naval advantage which can be reasonably secured should be eagerly seized, especially when combined with great commercial possibilities. It is said that the canal would be strategically worth two more "Dreadnoughts" to the nation at the cost of one-fifth of a "Dreadnought" per annum, a cost which would disappear as the canal rose in commercial prosperity. "Dreadnoughts" are built to-day and scrapped to-morrow, and in the interval are not channels of commerce, but the Scottish Ship Canal once made could never be destroyed, and like canals all over the world it would be a national and commercial asset of enduring and increasing value.

ROBERT BIRD.

POST OFFICE DIPLOMACY

The Marconi Enquiry has now advanced far enough to show us the various stages through which these most peculiar negotiations passed. At least half a dozen successive developments may be distinguished among them, and at each stage a different set of negotiators appear to have taken them in hand. This has led to a wide range of responsibility for the agreement—a circumstance very consolatory to Sir Alexander King (General Secretary to the Post Office). He repeatedly reminded the House of Commons Committee of Inquiry that the agreement with the Marconi Company was not the work of the Post Office alone: that several other Departments had been engaged on it and were equally answerable for it.

This indeed is one of the most curious features of the agreement—the number and variety of Departmental experts to say nothing of Cabinet Ministers who assisted at its birth. A long procession of them have appeared before the Committee and with touching unanimity have expressed strong approval of their own handiwork. The chief negotiators have yet to come, and from them still stronger approbation may be anticipated. But the louder the chorus of self-praise raised in the committee room the more obvious it seems that the affair was a huge muddle from beginning to end. The only Department that emerges from it without loss of credit is the Colonial Office, which wisely declined to have anything to do with it.

The first of the half-dozen stages through which the negotiations were dragged out was the ten months from March 1910 to the beginning of 1911, when the Colonial Office kept the original proposal of Mr. Godfrey Isaacs quietly pigeon-holed.

In the second stage it was handed on to the Board of Trade, which happened to have at its disposal a committee of experts

known as the Cables Landing Rights Committee. This was a most catholic and comprehensive body embracing representatives of no less than eight Departments—the Admiralty, the War Office, the Foreign Office, the India Office, Colonial Office, Post Office, Treasury, and Board of Trade. The Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Trade was its chairman, and it stood in close relation to the Imperial Defence Committee, some of its members being also on that committee.

The third stage covered the early months of 1911, when the Cables Landing Rights Committee held a number of meetings to discuss the original Marconi scheme—namely, the proposed licence for eighteen long-distance stations to be erected by the Marconi Company at its own cost and its own risk. In May 1911 a report was sent to the Imperial Defence Committee rejecting that scheme and recommending in place of it the erection of six experimental stations, to be State owned and operated—which "should be established by the State" were the words used. The Imperial Defence Committee at once appointed a sub-committee to examine this alternative plan, and their report was received a month later. It was evidently hurried up in order to be ready for the Imperial Conference which was to meet in June 1911. Its recommendation was that "the stations should be erected as soon as possible and that the work should be put in hand before the end of the year."

This was the first of the "urgency" alarms which have since been so frequently reiterated in the House of Commons and before the Committee of Enquiry. Captain Charlton, who rang the changes on urgency in his evidence, was a member of the sub-committee that started the cry in 1911. Naturally, he adheres to the motto with which he set out. But in course of these long and tortuous negotiations the term "urgency" acquired a double significance. At first it was applied to the general policy of Imperial wireless stations and had no particular reference to the Marconi scheme. Latterly the Marconi clique appropriated it to their own use and tried to make out, as they are still doing, that what is urgent is to come to terms with them.

The two things are entirely different, and in the early stages of the negotiations it was urgency in the broader sense that was understood. Such certainly was the intention of the sub-com-

mittee of Imperial Defence when they declared for immediate action. It was assumed then that the Marconi Company would meet the Government in a reasonable spirit. But when Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, counting his chickens before they were hatched, put forward preposterous demands, the idea of urgency was driven into the background. The Imperial Defence Committee, far from allowing themselves to be hurried into immediate action in order to oblige Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, took nearly six months to consider the report of their sub-committee.

Though this had been presented in June 1911, it was not approved until the following December. Meanwhile the Imperial Conference had passed an academic resolution "in favour of a chain of British State-owned wireless stations within the Empire," and had appointed a committee to work out the details. But neither was there here any great display of urgency. The committee thus appointed, which afterwards became known as the "Imperial Wireless Committee," did not meet until August 1911. It was taken charge of by Mr. Samuel, the Postmaster-General, who spoke of it in the House of Commons as "his committee."

Here we enter the fourth stage of the negotiations in which the principal parts were played by the Postmaster-General and two committees—the Imperial Wireless and the Cables Landing Rights Committee. The Committee of Imperial Defence now retired into the background after throwing out—through its sub-committee—a suggestion that "in order to facilitate the friendly solution of questions of patent rights, and with a view to ensuring the cordial co-operation of the Company, an arrangement should be made with the Marconi Company to erect the stations at cost price plus an agreed percentage." This had, however, become a mere pious wish in consequence of the exorbitant value which the Marconi Company set on its co-operation. For its patent rights it claimed a cool quarter of a million sterling cash down, and by way of royalty a halfpenny per word on every message. No patentee of the ordinary sort; no man without exceptional influence of some kind could have dared to hint at such terms. If he had been fool enough to do it, the probability is that he would have been promptly shown the door. Can this have been what the Committee of Imperial Defence really meant

to do with Mr. Godfrey Isaacs when it handed him over to the Postmaster-General and his two committees?

Mr. Godfrey Isaacs was now beginning to be recognised as a hard nut to crack. The patience and forbearance with which he was treated by the crowd of official negotiators were simply amazing. They had to bridge over an immense gap between the Marconi Company's valuation of its services and the value put upon them by the Sub-Committee of Imperial Defence. Evidently the latter had started with the idea that a friendly arrangement—fair both to the Government and the Company—might be easily arrived at. The quarter-million cash down and the halfpenny per word royalty was a staggerer to them: so much so that the alternative of direct State construction was seriously considered.

The Sub-Committee of Imperial Defence recommended that "failing a satisfactory arrangement on this basis (the Marconi Company to build the stations at cost price plus an agreed percentage), they should be erected by the Admiralty and worked by the civil authorities of the Governments concerned." The task committed to the Postmaster-General was either to bring the Marconi Company to reason or to get the six Imperial stations erected independently of them. He was provided with ample powers, statutory and otherwise, for the purpose. At this stage the Admiralty were not merely willing but anxious to undertake the work, and there were strong reasons for having the whole control of long-distance wireless telegraphy kept in their hands.

At the same time the legal powers required for dealing with questions of patent rights were ample. The Patents and Designs Act, 1907, gave the Postmaster-General the right to use any patent or invention on terms to be agreed upon with the patentee, or "in default of agreement to be settled by the Treasury after hearing all the parties interested." Can it be doubted that if Mr. Godfrey Isaacs had been a common or garden patentee this Act would have been unceremoniously applied to him? Had the Lodge Muirhead or the Poulsen Syndicate been in his place they would have been snuffed out with it before they had time to utter a protest.

But the sacred person of Mr. Godfrey Isaacs could not be thus impiously treated. The great man's obstinacy had to be respected if not for his own sake then perhaps for the sake of the

name he bore. For nearly a year the Postmaster-General and his two committees (Imperial Wireless and Cables Landing Rights) reasoned with him, entreated him, and sometimes even dared to get angry with him, but all to small purpose. Now and then he yielded an inch, but only in order to get an ell for it later on.

From August 1911 to January 1912 the collective experts of eight public Departments struggled with these Imperial wireless negotiations. Why so much trouble should have been taken to induce Mr. Godfrey Isaacs to accept fair terms when the means of obtaining them by statutory arbitration lay ready to hand is inconceivable to the ordinary business mind. With the help of the Act of 1907 he and his patent rights could have been got rid of in a few days or weeks at most, and the building of the Imperial wireless stations might have been begun as the Imperial Wireless Committee urged "before the end of the year." But not only was Mr. Godfrey Isaacs raised above the law as if he were a privileged trade unionist: the Post Office went far beyond that, and when opposition unexpectedly arose it turned against the intruder and became the champion and defender of its protégé. Stranger still, it now assures us that this was the very perfection of diplomacy! It says a great deal for the pluck of Mr. Isaacs and for his faith in his mascot that to the bitter end he fought inch by inch for his irrational demands. Even when the Poulsen Syndicate crossed his path and came so very near upsetting him in the last ditch, he held on grimly to the Marconi ultimatum.

At the end of the fourth stage of the negotiations (August 1911 to January 1912) Mr. Godfrey Isaacs had discovered the impossibility of his quarter-million cash down and a halfpenny per word of royalty on messages. That had to go by the board, but a number of substantial substitutes for it were obtained from the Post Office diplomatists, who, according to Captain Charlton, were desperately afraid of being thought stingy. By playing skilfully on their magnanimity Mr. Isaacs got from them a twenty-eight years' guarantee of his patents, young and old, without any inconvenient enquiry into their age, their validity, or their efficiency. This was more valuable to him than two fourteen-year extensions of the original patents would have been: a concession which no previous patentee had ever dared to hope for.

He also secured 10 per cent. royalties on the gross earnings of the stations for eighteen years certain, and a possible ten years more. As a minor favour he was granted the right of search against all the apparatus and inventions which his competitors might try to introduce into the Imperial wireless scheme.

Concessions like these can hardly be called stingy. Though they possibly fell a good deal short of the quarter-million dream of Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, they far over-shot what the Sub-Committee of Imperial Defence had expected him to be satisfied with. Sir Alexander King's modest estimate of the 10-per cent. royalty—which, however, he admitted to be a mere guess—was that it might be worth to the Marconi Company about £30,000 a year: surely handsome remuneration for all that the Marconi Company had to give in return. The munificent and wholly uncommercial spirit in which the 10 per cent. royalty was arrived at may be inferred from the answer given by Captain Charlton to Mr. Parker's friendly question on the subject. Captain Charlton was expected to say that he considered it very reasonable, but this is the nearest he could come to that verdict.

(7126) I am afraid I am not a very good judge. We thought it rather high and we suggested first of all 3 per cent. on the net profits. Then it was pointed out to us that that was an exceedingly low commercial arrangement and would not be considered in business circles generally; that there would be no receipts to any extent unless the matter was a success and that if it was a success the higher percentage asked would not be a very great matter. It still seemed to us that 10 per cent. was high, but as far as we could judge it was not unduly high. I do not profess to be a judge myself, that was only my opinion.

With sailor-like honesty and candour Captain Charlton has here let one or two pretty big cats out of the bag. He practically admits that the Advisory Committees were a little shocked at the extent to which Mr. Godfrey Isaacs opened his mouth, and that they had to be talked over by somebody—presumably their Post Office friends—before they could swallow the 10 per cent. royalty. If he had known what a comparative trifle the Marconi Company had paid shortly before for the most valuable of these patents—the Lodge Muirhead—even he might not have been so easily talked over. As it is, he has said enough to prove that however anxious he may now be to have Mr. Godfrey Isaacs considered a paragon of reason and moderation he thought other-

wise at the time. He felt, in short, when his share of the negotiations closed at the end of January 1912, that the Marconi Company had been handsomely treated.

Another significant point in Captain Charlton's evidence, to which attention must be called, is the belief which he has repeatedly expressed that the terms approved by the Imperial Wireless Committee on January 17, and by the Cables Landing Rights Committee on January 24, were final. This has a very important bearing on the none too polite denial which the Postmaster-General gave in the House of Commons to my statement that the first edition of the Marconi tender was virtually accepted at the end of January. In self-defence, I felt constrained to address to the Chairman of the Committee of Enquiry a letter, quoting passages from the Postmaster-General's own speeches in the House of Commons as well as from the evidence of Sir Alexander King before the committee, completely bearing out the statement which he declared to be "wholly false."

Since then several more Post Office witnesses have appeared before the Committee of Enquiry, and their evidence further elucidates the point at issue. It is now possible for me to answer various correspondents who have asked me what can have been the motive of the Postmaster-General's intemperate attack on this isolated sentence in one of the *National Review* articles. Various reasons suggest themselves for the deep offence it has given him.

First, it called attention to the very important and for the Postmaster-General serious fact that at the end of January he dispensed with the services of both his expert Committees.

Second, in dispensing with the assistance of these Committees he broke away from the other seven public Departments which they represented and took the responsibility of all further negotiations on himself.

Third, these facts greatly qualify the assurance which he gave to the House of Commons on October 11 that the negotiations had been conducted by Committees representative of all the services interested in an Imperial wireless scheme including the Dominion Governments.

Fourth, they are at variance with Sir Alexander King's contention that the seven other public Departments which took part

in the negotiations were equally responsible with the Post Office for the agreement.

Fifth, they give peculiar significance to the new departure made by the Post Office after January 24, when it began a fresh series of negotiations with Mr. Godfrey Isaacs. These negotiations extending from the end of January to March 7, when, in Mr. Samuel's own punctilious language, "a tender was accepted in general terms," were practically secret. They were carried on behind the backs of the other Departments as well as of the two expert Committees. The final results were not even communicated to them except in a round-about non-official way.

Sixth, before these secret negotiations began the only other possible competitor of the Marconi Company was shut out by imposing on him preliminary conditions which were absurd and impossible on the face of them. Having thus got rid of the Poulsen Company, the expert Committees, all the public Departments other than the Post Office, and also the Dominion Governments, Mr. Samuel devoted the following six weeks to chaffering with Mr. Godfrey Isaacs. That was really what it came to in the end, and the evidence of the Post Office witnesses who have appeared before the Committee of Enquiry during the past month as to how they were carried on, is calculated to shock diplomatists of the old school.

The five Post Office witnesses who came after Sir Alexander King, namely, Mr. Taylor, Captain Charlton, Commander Loring, Mr. Lewelyn Davies (the solicitor who drew the contract), and Mr. Farnall, one of the assistant secretaries, have all succeeded, though quite unintentionally, in springing surprises on the Committee and the public. With equally little desire or intention they have all helped to prepare a very awkward dilemma for their Chief when his turn comes. In the long series of damaging disclosures which they have made, what the Postmaster-General is likely to feel most keenly is Mr. Farnall's description of the free and easy way in which the personal negotiations were conducted during this final stage.

They assumed various unconventional forms—private interviews between Mr. Godfrey Isaacs and the heads of the Post Office, including occasionally the Postmaster-General himself, correspondence, memoranda, and verbal messages. Mr. Farnall

was present at most of the interviews and wrote minutes of them, but not at the time, only from memory afterwards. A number of these memoranda were put in and they were found to be on loose sheets of paper with the dates somewhat mixed. They began apparently in December 1911, while the Committees were still in being, and extended into February 1912 when they became specially interesting. The Postmaster-General is more than once referred to as having been present along with Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, and with having taken part in the proceedings.

Concurrently with the private interviews at the Post Office a lively and also rather unconventional correspondence was carried on by the negotiators. In the official record submitted to the Committee a significant gap was discovered. On February 12, 1912, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs wrote to the Post Office thanking them for "sending back the draft tender." But there was no record of the draft tender referred to having been received by the Post Office from the Marconi Company. Mr. Farnall explained that it was "a rough draft tender" which had been handed to him by Mr. Godfrey Isaacs! On examining the "rough draft tender" Mr. Faber detected alterations that had been made in it by Mr. Isaacs. He asked for the original draft before it had been altered, but Mr. Farnall thought it had been returned to the Marconi Company and that they must still have it. Mr. Faber retorted:

(9380) Do you really mean that the Post Office did not keep a copy? It was only a rough thing perhaps.

(9381) Only a rough thing—a tender on which the whole of this structure has been built up. You have not got in the Post Office a copy of the original tender. A fresh tender was sent in. An actual binding tender was sent in immediately after the letter you refer to.

(9382) Well, the gap remains. We cannot take it any further, but I should like to make an observation. It seems extraordinary to me that you should not have in the pigeon-holes at the Post Office a copy, at any rate, of the original tender handed in to you by Mr. Godfrey Isaacs.

Presumably the draft tender which got Mr. Farnall into this trouble was the one which had been approved by the Imperial Wireless Committee and the Cables Landing Rights Committee at their final meetings in January. They had hardly been bowed out when Mr. Godfrey Isaacs began to make alterations in it. How far and in how many different points he was allowed to alter

it can only be ascertained hereafter on comparing it with the second edition which was sent in and hurriedly accepted on March 7 after the Treasury had telephoned its approval.

It may now be seen why the Postmaster-General does not like to be reminded of the draft tender which his two Committees approved on January 17 and 24, but which the heads of the Post Office so little appreciated that they lost the original copy of it. Mr. Farnall had no explanation to offer of its disappearance except that it must have been returned to the Marconi Company. Anyhow, Mr. Isaacs was allowed to make a fresh start, which he had evidently done before February 13, when an altered draft appeared on the scene. The members of the two Committees had probably been surprised to hear long afterwards how coolly the tender they recommended had been set aside, and Mr. Godfrey Isaacs's new version put in its place. That they considered their action at the end of January to be definite there can be little doubt. They must have had something before them from the Marconi Company when they authorised the Postmaster-General to accept it subject to certain conditions. If so, was it not the rough draft which by February 13 had mysteriously disappeared?

Captain Charlton in his account of the final meeting of the Imperial Wireless Committee spoke as if that Committee had had before it some definite proposal of the Marconi Company. In his opinion it was even more than "a rough tender." Replying to friendly questions by Mr. Parker, he spoke of it as an agreement:

(7140) *It was quite clear to me at that meeting that it was intended that this agreement should be gone on with, that is to say the agreement between the committee and the Marconi Company. I was quite clear in my own mind as to the intention of this committee.* With regard to the sub-committee of technical experts I thought they ought to be appointed with a view mainly, if it was found necessary to immediately adopt another system, of getting their opinion as to the value of that other system.

For the time being it was to be Marconi at all hazards, but in case Marconi should not turn out all right these wise and cautious negotiators were to keep the Poulsen System in reserve to fall back upon! To do otherwise would, they thought, have been "dishonourable" (Sir Alexander King). It would have been treating Marconi stingily (Captain Charlton). The suspicion that they were playing fast and loose with what their own scientific

experts had pronounced to be a better system than Marconi's, seems never to have crossed their minds. Still less did they ask themselves if they were acting in the best interests of the country and the Empire.

One crucial fact which neither the Postmaster-General nor his two committees—the Imperial Wireless and the Cables Landing Rights—can now get away from is that on January 24, 1912 it was decided to accept a Marconi tender subject to one or two modifications, which the Company should have had no difficulty in accepting. The Poulsen alternative, on the other hand, was saddled with two conditions so obviously impossible as to suggest that they were intended to be prohibitive. The least that the Marconi Company might now have been expected to do was to receive thankfully the fat contract which their friends in office had fought so hard to secure for them. But they were not grateful, they were not even satisfied. Mr. Godfrey Isaacs had still another string to his bow, and he pulled it as remorselessly as he had done all the others.

For the Postmaster-General himself this final stage of the negotiations will be the most difficult to explain and to justify.

Having parted with his two committees, which never met again after January 17 and 24 respectively, he proceeded to make further concessions to Mr. Godfrey Isaacs. He received protests from other public Departments, the Treasury and the Admiralty in particular, as to certain objectionable provisions in the agreement, and he signed it nevertheless. One of these reached him on March 7, the very day when the second edition of the agreement—the Postmaster-General's own edition—was accepted.

The cavalier treatment bestowed on the Admiralty is suggestive of friction between the two Departments, though, of course, both of them would scorn the thought now that they are good friends again. But Admiralty letters, with passages in them like the following, are seldom written in a purely philosophical spirit:

> My Lords cannot but express their regret that it has not been found possible to adhere to the very clear terms of the releasing clause originally accepted by the Company in their tender of February 18, and they trust that it is still not too late to reinstate the clause in that form. They are not aware of the precise motives which may have lead the Postmaster-General to assent to its modifications.

"The releasing clause," from which Mr. Godfrey Isaacs was allowed by the Postmaster-General to back out at the last moment, referred to the agreement of 1903, which the Admiralty had been chafing under for several years. The first edition of the Marconi Company's tender approved by the two committees at the end of January contained a complete release from this agreement, but the second edition of March 7 introduced nullifying restrictions which would have left the Admiralty very much as they were before. When Mr. Parker, a friend of the agreement, tried to score a point for it off this sham release he failed badly. The following was his question to Captain Charlton, and the Captain's answer:

(7156) The Admiralty seems to have done as well out of this agreement as anybody by getting rid of that agreement of 1903. I am afraid we have not quite got rid of it as we should have liked to have done. We have made a start on right lines, but it requires more than one party to give an undertaking. You will see in Clause XII as it is now worded that we have got to give an undertaking not to communicate and each Department also has got to give an undertaking. Therefore it is no use our giving an undertaking only because we have no one else we can communicate with unless they also give an undertaking.

Mr. Godfrey Isaacs was trying to play the Laocoön on the Post Office and the Admiralty, and the Postmaster-General, if he did not actually assist him to do it, did little to prevent him. If the Admiralty experts had not been more wide awake than their friends at the Post Office were, the alteration which was smuggled at the last moment into the "releasing clause" might have become binding. As it was, the Post Office signed it and has not yet succeeded in obtaining the full release for which the Admiralty had all along stipulated.

This is only one sample of the ingenuous, or shall we say disingenuous, diplomacy with which the Marconi agreement was achieved. The Treasury had also to protest, and quite as strongly as the Admiralty, against clauses which on the face of them were contrary to the public interest. It is all the more serious that some of these incidents happened in the final stage, when the negotiations between the Post Office and the Marconi Company had become purely personal. Awkward questions may have to be asked as to how these postscriptal arrangements were conducted. How often, and to what extent, did the Postmaster-

General take part in them himself, and how far was the Permanent Secretary employed as an intermediary? Now that we have had full opportunity to estimate the diplomatic skill of Sir Alexander King, it will be doubly interesting to learn what was his share in the final round with Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, and what the Postmaster-General reserved for himself.

Reviewing the whole course of the negotiations, the general verdict on them may be summed up in the homely proverb about too many cooks spoiling the broth. It was all the worse for the broth that so many of the cooks happened to be subordinate officials with political chiefs to consider. From the Committee of Imperial Defence down to the boomers of Marconi shares, there is no trace of a single man who had thought out the problem of long-distance wireless telegraphy. Neither in the Cabinet, the Imperial Conference, the Cables Landing Rights Committee, nor the Imperial Wireless Committee, do we find evidence of an all-round qualified negotiator. The Admiralty experts understood their little corner of the question and they stuck to that. The War Office men said very little, but doubtless thought a lot. The Board of Trade, which should by rights have taken a leading part in the negotiations, abdicated in favour of the Post Office, with the result that the commercial aspect of the question has never yet been mentioned except by naval and military witnesses who cheerfully admitted that they knew nothing at all about it.

Such a crowd of official specialists promiscuously flung together was bound to be at the mercy of a clever opponent like Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, who knew the pull he had on them and did not scruple to use it. How hard pressed they were in their prolonged duel with him may be gathered from the multitude of excuses and explanations they have to offer to the Committee of Enquiry. Some of them have had to resort pretty freely to casuistry which, in fact, may be said to have characterised the negotiations throughout. If one quality more than another has distinguished them all through it is their lack of straightforwardness. The Post Office diplomatists, in particular, do not seem to have been able to treat anybody frankly—neither their colleagues on the committees, nor the other public Departments, nor the House of Commons, nor the public. If we may judge by their letters and speeches they have almost elevated casuistry into a fine art. The

different kinds of quibbles which appear to have been practised on that unhappy agreement would make a long catalogue. Such free and ample scope has it furnished for them that a score of distinct subjects might be mentioned which have fallen a prey to the quibbler and the casuist.

There has been prolonged and systematic quibbling: First, about the duration of the agreement. Second, about the contingencies by which it might be terminated. Third, about the *raison d'etre* of the royalties. Fourth, about the conditions of their payment. Fifth, about the power of the Post Office to cease paying them. Sixth, about the value of the competing patents—Marconi, Poulsen, and Goldschmidt. Seventh, about the single and duplex systems. Eighth, about the character of the stations, their equipment and the apparatus used. Ninth, about their respective ranges, speeds, and degrees of secrecy. Tenth, about the means of defending them and its probable cost.

In addition to these, which may be distinguished as the technical quibbles, there have been other cross-currents of casuistry. The correspondence with the tenderers, with the other public Departments and with the Dominion Governments never seems to have followed a straight course. The Post Office too often appears to be trying to get ahead of the more cautious associates and to confront them with accomplished facts. It was very unfortunate, to put it mildly, in its misunderstandings with the other public Departments, in the mistakes made by its scientific experts in their financial estimates, in the wrong impressions it allowed to pass uncorrected ; in the repeated modifications admitted into the original tender after it had been virtually accepted ; in the prolonged delay in getting out the specifications which, I believe, are not completed even yet ; worst of all, in the proposed secret clause which the Postmaster-General foresaw difficulty with, but thought it might perhaps be arranged "if a general agreement is arrived at."

The Postmaster-General has been throughout these negotiations the champion casuist, but his lieutenant, Sir Alexander, has played a good second to him. Both of them are great sticklers about words and dates. Mr. Samuel becomes at times almost jesuitical in his fine distinctions between "accepting" and "signing," also between a tender, an agreement, and a contract,

In the debate of October 11, when Sir Henry Norman referred to the agreement of March 7, he broke in with a sharp exclamation, "There is no agreement." Sir Henry offered to use any term that his right hon. friend would suggest to him. Might he say "approved and signed a contract"? "No, sir," promptly replied Mr. Samuel, "I signed no contract. The Marconi Company put in a tender in general terms. A letter was written by the Post Office accepting the tender upon which a contract was subsequently to be based."

Sir Henry Norman tried again to placate this verbal hair-splitter, and suggested as a proper phrase that "the Postmaster-General signed a document." But still he did not hit the mark. "Somebody wrote a letter," interjected the Postmaster-General. Sir Henry had then to give it up, but he did not do it without a protest. "Really, if I may respectfully say so, that is rather a quibble," was his parting shot. Still the Postmaster-General had the last word. "There was no contract," he reiterated: an assertion which no lawyer will endorse unless he happens to be of the very newest forensic and political school. It has been distinctly questioned by at least one eminent legal member of the Committee of Enquiry.

It cannot be supposed for a moment that Mr. Samuel's casuistry is sheer cussedness, as an unconventional American might call it. There is method in it and likewise motive. Apparently he is anxious to postpone his personal responsibility for the agreement to the latest possible moment. He will not answer for it while it was "a tender in general terms" on March 7, still less when it was only "a rough draft" at the end of January. The essential fact, however, remains that the Post Office pledged itself to the Marconi Company within a few days of January 24, when Mr. Samuel announced to the Imperial Wireless Committee that if he could not arrange with the Poulsen Company to undertake a physical impossibility—namely, to give within three months a practical demonstration of day and night wireless telegraphy at a range of two thousand miles—he would inform Mr. Godfrey Isaacs that the committee felt inclined to recommend the acceptance of his tender.

A nod was as good as a wink to Messrs. Godfrey Isaacs and Co. It did not matter to them what Mr. Samuel chose to call his

acceptance, or how many grammatical hairs he split over it. They had got a virtual promise of the job and that was enough for them. The trouble and worry that the Post Office had afterwards in licking the tender into shape did not concern them. The moment that Mr. Godfrey Isaacs got the Postmaster-General's letter intimating the intention of the Imperial Wireless Committee to recommend the acceptance of his tender he knew that he was quite safe. Any business man in his place would have thought the same. No public Department, much less a Cabinet Minister, could have backed out of such a letter, or even out of a verbal promise given in such circumstances.

Then why does the Postmaster-General quibble about dates and words when the facts are so clearly against him? His official responsibility for the arrangement dates not from July 19, when the contract was signed, nor from March 7, when it was accepted, but from the end of January, when Mr. Godfrey Isaacs was notified that he was going to get it. If any litigation were to arise over it, this is undoubtedly the position which the Marconi Company would take up, and rightly so. What other ground could be taken up by a public body in a case where there are two competing tenderers, and one is told that his tender is to be refused, while the other is told that his is to be accepted?

The motive of the Postmaster-General's anxiety to keep clear of the end of January does not lie on the surface, and many people have been perplexed by it. But it is to be found in a careful comparison of certain passages in his speech of October 11, with the account of the January negotiations, which has been given to the Committee of Enquiry. On October 11 his defence was that he had followed throughout the advice of his expert advisers, and that personally he had had very little to do with the negotiations.

> It has been suggested [he said] that I as the Minister responsible for the conclusion of this contract was in a position to show favour to this particular Company. This is said by people who have an idea that these matters are arranged between Ministers personally and the Directors of the Companies concerned. I do not deny that I am responsible for this contract and if any blame attaches to any one it attaches to me. I should like to say the suggestion that the matter was discussed privately or secretly between myself and the Company is utterly preposterous as it must have appeared to any hon. member acquainted with the way in which Government affairs are managed.

Mr. Samuel does not go quite so far here as the Attorney-General did in the same debate, when he said, regarding his official opposition to the extension of the Lodge-Muirhead patent, that he had "simply signed the papers." But his language certainly suggested to the House of Commons and the public that he had taken no personal share in the negotiations. The evidence of Mr. Farnall, one of the assistant secretaries of the Post Office who made the "notes from memory" of Mr. Samuel's final interview with Mr. Godfrey Isaacs hardly squares with that declaration.

It is now abundantly clear from the official minutes and correspondence furnished to the Committee that the Postmaster-General did rather more than merely supervise the negotiations, especially toward the end; that at critical points he interposed like a *deus ex machina;* and that he had interviews with Mr. Godfrey Isaacs. Stickler as he is for verbal precision, he might not admit that these interviews were either private or secret, but they were certainly exceptional and few public contractors have ever been so honoured. When the whole truth comes out it may be found that the Marconi Company and its Managing Director got much farther into the Post Office than persons in like case usually do.

W. R. Lawson.

GREATER BRITAIN

CANADIAN AFFAIRS

On the first Thursday in December the Canadian Prime Minister rose in his place in the House of Commons to deliver his long-expected and long-premeditated speech on Canada's new naval policy, and when he sat down amid a scene of wild enthusiasm, the future of the Empire was assured for the next century or so. It has always been thought not only in Germany but also in the United States (where the German element is now the strongest factor in a heterogeneous population) that Canada, a land-locked Power, would never consent to follow the example of Australia and New Zealand in making a substantial and effective contribution to the Imperial Navy. *Agnosco fortunam Carthaginis* might well have been the quotation that came into the mind of those Germans who drink to "The Day" when they heard of Canada's gift of three super-Dreadnoughts. There can be no doubt that the vast majority of Canadians, who have long since been weary of mere professions of devotion to the Empire and the after-dinner magniloquence of Imperialist orators, are delighted with Mr. Borden's proposals and with the remarkable speech which justified them.

Mr. Borden, it is hardly necessary to say, succeeded in lifting his speech far above the plane of party controversies. The temperate and statesmanlike tone of his argument was, in point of fact, warmly praised by the Leader of the Opposition. After touching on the wonderful development of Canada's resources during the last quarter of a century and the evolution which has proceeded *pari passu* of its constitutional relations with the rest of the Empire, he went on to deal with the importance of Imperial sea-power:

The responsibility for the Empire's defence upon the high seas, in which is to be found the only effective guarantee of its existence, and which hitherto has been assumed by the United Kingdom, has necessarily carried with it the responsibility for and the control of foreign policy. With the enormous increase of naval power, which has been undertaken by all the great nations in recent years, this tremendous responsibility has cast an almost impossible burden upon the British Islands, which for nearly a thousand years have exercised so profound an influence upon the world's history.* That burden is so great that the day has come when either the existence of the Empire will be imperilled, or the young and mighty Dominions must join with the Mother Land to make secure the common safety and the common heritage of all. When Great Britain no longer assumes sole responsibility for defence upon the high seas she can no longer undertake to assume sole responsibility for and sole control of foreign policy, which is closely, vitally, and constantly associated with that defence in which the Dominions participate.

It has been declared in the past, and even during recent years, that the responsibility for foreign policy could not be shared by Great Britain with the Dominions. In my humble opinion adherence to such a position could have but one and that a most disastrous result. During my recent visit to the British Islands I ventured on many public occasions to propound the principle that the great Dominions, sharing in the defence of the Empire upon the high seas, must necessarily be entitled to share also in the responsibility for and in the control of foreign policy. No declaration I made was greeted more heartily and enthusiastically than this. It is satisfactory to know to-day that not only his Majesty's Ministers, but also the leaders of the opposite political party in Great Britain, have explicitly accepted this principle, and have affirmed the conviction that the means by which it can be constitutionally accomplished must be sought, discovered, and utilised without delay.

There followed a quotation from a speech delivered in the House of Commons two years ago (when Mr. Borden was in opposition), in which the necessity of obtaining for Canada a voice in defining the foreign policy of the Empire was vigorously enforced. After referring to his mission to the Mother Country and reading the Admiralty Memorandum (which seems to all Canadians a fair and dignified attempt to describe the strategic situation) and explaining the inevitable effects of the destruction or disablement of the Navy on the fortunes of Canada and the other Dominions beyond the seas, Mr. Borden dwelt on the results of concentrating the effective naval forces of the Empire within the European danger-zone:

The great outstanding fact which arrests our attention in considering the existing conditions of naval power is this. Twelve years ago the British Navy and the British Flag were predominant in every ocean of the world and along

the shores of every continent. To-day they are predominant nowhere except in the North Sea. The paramount duty of ensuring safety in home waters has been fulfilled by withdrawing or reducing squadrons in every part of the world, and by concentrating nearly all the effective naval forces in close proximity to the British Islands. In 1902 there were 55 British warships on the Mediterranean station; to-day there are 19. There were 14 on the North American and West Indies stations; to-day there are three. There were three on the South-east coast of South America; to-day there is one. There were 16 on the Cape of Good Hope station; to-day there are three. There were eight on the Pacific station; to-day there are two. There were 42 on the China station; to-day there are 31. There were 12 on the Australian station; to-day there are eight. There were ten on the East Indies station, to-day there are nine. To sum up, in 1902 there were 160 ships on foreign and Colonial stations against 76 to-day. Do not imagine that this result has been brought about by any reduction in expenditure, for the case is practically the reverse. Great Britain's total naval expenditure in 1902 was less than $152,000,000 (£30,400,000). For the present fiscal year it exceeds $220,000,000 (£44,000,000). Why, then, has the naval force of the Empire been so enormously reduced throughout the world while at the same time the expenditure has increased nearly 50 per cent.? For the simple reason that the increasing strength of other navies, and especially of the German Navy, has compelled Great Britain not only to increase her Fleet, but to concentrate it in the vicinity of the British Islands, and there has been, of course, a substantial increase in the strength in home waters. In short, the strain of meeting changed conditions has been so heavy and unceasing that, in spite of the largely increased expenditure and every possible exertion, the Admiralty has been compelled, by the pressure of circumstances, to withdraw or diminish the forces throughout the world which, in time of peril, safeguarded the security and integrity of the King's Dominions, and, in time of peace, were the living and visible symbol of the tie that unites all the subjects of the Crown.

In these circumstances in what way could Canada's help be most effectively rendered? He had consulted the British Government, and their answer had been unhesitating and unequivocal: "*We have no hesitation in answering, after a prolonged consideration of all the circumstances, that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.*" In view of that reply he asked the people of Canada, through their Parliament, to grant the sum of $35,000,000 (about £7,000,000) to the Crown to provide for the building of three battleships of the most powerful kind possible, with the necessary armament and the first outfit of ordnance, stores, and ammunition.

Inasmuch as the plant for building "Dreadnoughts" does not at present exist in Canada these vessels would be built under

Admiralty supervision in the United Kingdom. Even if an attempt could be made to build them in Canada the additional cost ($12,000,000 for the three) and the delay, which could hardly be estimated, would be prohibitive. Shipbuilding of this kind must begin in a smaller way. The Admiralty were prepared, moreover, in the early future to give orders for the construction in Canada of small cruisers, oil-tank vessels, and auxiliary craft of various kinds. After pointing out that the Canadian battleships would be "an aid brought by the Canadian people to the King as a token of their determination to maintain the integrity of the Empire and assist in repelling any danger which may threaten its security" and would bear names associated with Canadian history, Mr. Borden went on to point out what Canada would have to pay for naval protection if the Empire was dissolved as the result of a great defeat on the high seas:

But if we should neglect the duty which I conceive we owe to ourselves, and if irreparable disaster should ensue, what will be our future destiny? Obviously as an independent nation or as an important part of the great neighbouring Republic. What then would be our responsibilities, and what would be the burden upon us for a protection on the high seas much less powerful and less effective than that which we enjoy to-day? Take the case of one nation whose territory, resources, population, and wealth may fairly be compared with those in Canada. The naval estimates of Argentina for the four years from 1909 to 1912 inclusive amounted to $35,000,000 (£7,000,000). No information is available as to the exact proportion of the last-mentioned sum which has been appropriated for naval purposes, but it is understood that the far greater portion is for naval construction. It is safe, therefore, to estimate that during the past four years Argentina has expended for naval purposes not less than from $65,000,000 to $70,000,000 (£13,000,000 to £14,000,000). The Federal and State expenditure of the United States comprises a total outlay for armaments of between $250,000,000 and $300,000,000 (£50,000,000 and £60,000,000), or at the rate of $2·75 per head. Similar expenditure by Canada would mean an annual outlay of some $20,000,000 to $25,000,000, or between $80,000,000 and $100,000,000 during the same period.

In conclusion Mr. Borden dealt with the difficult, but surely not insoluble, problem of securing to the Dominions a share in the control of the Empire's foreign policy.

I am assured by his Majesty's Government that pending a final solution of the question of voice and influence they would welcome the presence in London of a Canadian Minister during the whole or a portion of each year. Such Minister would be regularly summoned to all meetings of the Committee of Imperial Defence and be regarded as one of its permanent members. No

important step in foreign policy would be undertaken without consultation with such representative of Canada. This means a very marked advance both from our standpoint and from that of the United Kingdom. It would give us the opportunity of consultation and therefore influence which hitherto we have not possessed. The conclusions and declarations of Great Britain in respect of foreign relations could not fail to be strengthened by the knowledge that such consultation and co-operation with the Overseas Dominions had become an accomplished fact.

At the conclusion of this historic utterance the whole assemblage (with the unfortunate exception of Mr. Oliver, formerly Minister of the Interior in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's last Cabinet) rose to their feet and sang the National Anthem. There can be no doubt whatever that Canadian opinion is overwhelmingly in favour of Mr. Borden's proposals and that the attempt on the part of the Liberal leaders to oppose them will only result in further losses of prestige and numerical strength. It is only among the Nationalists of Quebec, a small and ineffectual remnant, that the cry of "tribute" will be taken seriously. The Liberals of Ontario and, I believe, of the Maritime Provinces, would, if they were asked, admit that Mr. Borden has found the only solution of a pressing and perplexing problem. For which reason Sir Wilfrid Laurier's criticism, though temperate and well intentioned, need not be dealt with at length. There is, however, one point in the Liberal case which might be carefully considered by the Admiralty. It is suggested that this gift of battleships is unworthy of a great nation, because (1) they are not to be manned by Canadian sailors, and (2) the cost of maintenance in commission will be defrayed by the British taxpayer. As regards the second contention the remedy rests with Canada; as regards the first there seems to be no reason why an attempt should not be made to find naval recruits in that great and much-neglected nursery of seamen, the neighbouring island of Newfoundland. Enough cannot be found in Maritime Canada.

E. B. O.

"HOW I KEEP HEALTHY."

Personal Statements by well-known People.

One of the most distinguished men of to-day recently said to the present writer: "I was rather sceptical at first, you know—I suppose most people are, more or less. But when I saw so many well-known people recommending the stuff—some of them personal friends of mine—I knew there must be something in it. So I asked my doctor, and he said: 'Certainly, Sanatogen is a good thing. Take it by all means.' I took it, and it did me so much good that I felt bound to send a testimonial too."

Such is, no doubt, the history of most of the following letters, and of hundreds more which have been sent to us by equally distinguished men and women.

We believe, however, that a personal test of Sanatogen is better than any amount of documentary evidence; and we cordially invite every one who has not already made this test to do so to-day.

"When 'run down.'"

By **HENRY ARTHUR JONES**, the leading playright: "I have several times taken a course of Sanatogen when I've been 'run down,' and always with good results. It is a very valuable nerve tonic and food."

"For sleeplessness."

By **Sir THOMAS PITTAR, K.C.B., C.M.G.**: "Sir Thomas Pittar derives constant benefit from Sanatogen. He commenced to use it by his doctor's advice after a very serious operation, and is now using it as one of the best remedies for sleeplessness, taken on retiring to rest."

"That feeling of fatigue."

By **Sir LUKE WHITE, M.P.**: "My experience of Sanatogen confirms the medical opinion; there is no longer that feeling of fatigue, and there follows from its use a distinct restorative effect."

"Recovering from illness."

By **WALTER CRANE**, the eminent artist: "Recovering from a sharp attack of influenza, I certainly found Sanatogen very beneficial and strengthening in its effects."

Dyspepsia, anæmia, weakness, and depression are among the many complaints which disappear rapidly under a course of Sanatogen.

It restores and invigorates in a perfectly *natural* manner, and is absolutely free from any harmful effects; indeed, doctors prescribe it freely even for young babies as well as for delicate children, extremely old people, and invalids in the most dangerous condition.

Moreover, the effects of Sanatogen do not wear off, as with ordinary tonics, and it can be given up at any time without the slightest risk of reaction.

Don't wait till your health gets worse, but take the first step at once. Write to-day for a Free Sample—write now while the matter is fresh in your mind. Afterwards you can begin a regular course of Sanatogen, which is sold by all Chemists from 1s 9d per tin.

Please mention this paper and address A. Wulfing & Co., 12 Chenies Street, London, W.C. With the free sample will be sent an extremely interesting Booklet, entitled "Hints on Health," which fully explains the nature and uses of Sanatogen, and also contains a great deal of valuable information for health seekers.

THE

NATIONAL REVIEW

No. 360. FEBRUARY 1913

EPISODES OF THE MONTH

The European Peace

At the time of writing the European situation is almost as tangled as our domestic affairs. All we can do is to call attention to certain outstanding facts from which our readers may draw their own conclusions. We trust these conclusions may not be identical with those of our daily mentors who are very much in the state of a flock of sheep running hither and thither, terrified lest they should become detached from the main body and occupy an independent position. The cue this year has been to glorify the Concert of Europe and to belittle the handiwork of the Triple Entente to which alone is due the fact that so far at any rate a bloody local conflict in the Near East has been prevented from developing into a general conflagration. So long as the three Powers constituting this great pacific defensive combination stand shoulder to shoulder, resist the ceaseless intrigues overt and covert, to separate them, and—it is a large and—do their duty by themselves and by one another in developing their armaments on land and sea, there is a fair chance of continuing to keep the peace to which all statesmen and Sovereigns, even those who may have war in their hearts, pay outward ostentatious homage. Therefore the first duty of all good patriots in Russia, in France, and throughout the British Empire, after educating their compatriots by example and precept to love their own countries, is to "bonnet" the various disturbing

elements that for one reason or another would break up the common policy on which the security and peaceful progress of those States depends. We know the Russian Anglophobe who is either a stern unbending Tory, who has been taught to regard Potsdam as the hub of the universe and Prussian Junkerdom and the Prussian Monarchy as his models, or the Anarchist who objects to any policy which might strengthen the position of the present form of Government in Russia which he seeks to destroy. Surely these opponents of the Triple Entente ought to be able to answer one another. Foreigners cannot argue with them. The Russian reactionary, who is also a patriot, can only attain his desire of Prussianising his own Government by placing his country under the heel of her most dangerous and deadly enemy, while the Anarchist would only find himself out of the frying-pan into the fire, should he succeed in smashing the national policy which would place Russia at the mercy of the Mailed Fist. It is noteworthy, as bearing eloquent testimony to the effect of their mutual sacrifices in maintaining their armed strength, that to-day there is no serious anti-French party in Russia or anti-Russian party in France. The value of the Dual Alliance has proved itself over and over again at various crises during the last few years and the mutual loyalty of the allies is beyond suspicion.

Windbags

In France there is admittedly a small Anglophobe party, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say—as French hatred of England is a thing of the past—a party which distrusts us as unreliable and is puzzled and disturbed by the apparent blindness of British statesmen (who still pass on the Continent for being wideawake) to the prodigious and progressive increase in German armaments. The French are too polite to press the question upon their partners in the *Entente Cordiale*, but don't let us disguise the fact that there is a lot of quiet thinking on this question and that serious Frenchmen are alarmed by the continued refusal of Great Britain to put her army in order, and now that "the Admiralty" has publicly admitted the truth in its recent Memorandum on German naval competition, and acknowledges the growing sea-power of the Triple Alliance, France can be no longer fobbed off with the convenient excuse that Great Britain is making such stupendous naval exertions

as to explain if not justify her failure as a military Power. That we have refused to face a problem that stares us in the face and is becoming every day more acute, is true. That we are doing our duty in maintaining our naval supremacy is unfortunately untrue. We are now entering upon the danger-zone described by our well-informed contributor "Navalis," who has invariably proved to be in the right while his critics have been as invariably in the wrong. The French know the facts because their national existence is at stake and they can't afford to remain ignorant, and it is as useless to try and fool them as it is to fool the Germans. We elect to place wind-bags at the War Office and wind-bags at the Admiralty, and the only thing we shall ever get from wind-bags is—wind. There is any amount of "hot air" in Pall Mall and Whitehall and in after-dinner speeches, but very little else, and unfortunately newspapers which in days gone by used to keep a sharp eye on "Little Army" and "Little Navy" administration, and give a lead on national questions, especially questions of defence, are nowadays content to say ditto to Ministers and accept their speeches as serious substitutes for battalions and battleships. Meanwhile another section of the British Press to some extent controlled, inspired or bamboozled by the horde of aliens who are working overtime in the interests of Germany, miss few opportunities, or make opportunities when none present themselves, to "crab" France or Russia, to misrepresent their motives, to credit them with chauvinism, while they glorify the Germans as a peaceful people inspired by the single idea of "live and let live."

The German Claim

We grant that the Germans have the same claim on the Radical crank as the Boers in days gone by. After all, like President Kruger, the Germans mean to fall upon us at the appointed time, and just as President Kruger intended to clear Great Britain out of South Africa, so Germany means to destroy our Sea-power, and this naturally constitutes an overpowering attraction for the peculiar type of Radical infesting these islands, who is at once the friend of every enemy of his country and the enemy of every friend. Russia, who used to be the idol in the days of Mr. Gladstone when an Anglo-Russian War was never very far off, and France

who occupied a similar position can, now that they are friendly Powers, do no right; while Germany, on the other hand, the former bugbear of Gladstonianism, because she was mistakenly regarded as a friendly Power, can nowadays do no wrong, and apparently the single duty of British statesmen, according to the school of "enemies of our friends and friends of our enemies," is to lick the boots of the Germans, to accept all their pacific assurances at their face value, while rejecting all the pledges of Russia and France. And such forsooth are professional peace-mongers, though peace among the Great Powers has only been preserved in recent critical years, thanks to the loyal co-operation of France and Russia, and because the British Government—bad as it may be from a domestic point of view—are not such jackasses as the mass of their active supporters in the Press, in Parliament, in the Tabernacle, and on the platform. At the present moment, Germany is accelerating her preparations for war, and all the usual manœuvres are being resorted to to create an atmosphere in which it will be possible to launch yet another naval and military programme which will bring her still nearer her goal. Apparently the British Press, which has lost nearly all its spunk of late years, is afraid to call attention to these disagreeable facts. They are too alarming. They would spoil the "trade boom." Indeed, it is bad form to suspect Germany or to allude to the great additions which have been recently made to her army and her navy with the object of enabling the German Government to bring off "a Japanese coup" under circumstances which will give the other side practically no chance, all the more as he is likely to be "sleeping quietly in his bed" or hymning the praises of that great loving Christian kindred community across the North Sea which only asks for our affection.

The "Concert" Again

For the moment it is only permissible to discuss that delightfully happy family, "the Concert of Europe," which is supposed to have been concerting in London, though so far it must be said that the fruits of this international harmony are few and far between. "Poor dear Germany" has demonstrated afresh her devotion to peace, and only wicked Jingoes would dispute the value of the pacific propa-

ganda being conducted in this country—though not in any other country, so far as we know—which may be inspired by the highest motives but the effect of which, if successful, could only be to disarm Great Britain at the very moment that Germany is most formidable by land and sea. The number of busybodies all working on the same lines at the present time, many of whom have passed their lives or have their interests abroad, cannot fail to strike the casual observer. We know nothing whatsoever of Mr. Norman Angell—who is making himself conspicuous by writing and talking what we can only regard as decadent nonsense on the subject of peace when there is no peace—save what we learn from the new edition of *Who's Who*, where the biographies are not infrequently autobiographies. According to this authority, Mr. Norman Angell is a certain Mr. Lane, who has spent a great deal of his life in America and has acted as correspondent of various American newspapers. He has also been Editor of *Galignani's Messenger* and on the staff of the *Eclair* of Paris, while for the last few years he has been General Manager of the Paris *Daily Mail*, which possibly explains the extraordinary booming of his propaganda in the British Press. He is, needless to say, a member of the National Liberal Club and among other works has written a book entitled *Patriotism under Three Flags*. As we have said we know nothing whatsoever about him except what we glean from *Who's Who*, though we observe he is one of the heroes of the *Manchester Guardian*, whose foreign politics are well known. If this Mr. Norman Angell is sincerely devoted to Great Britain, and if he wishes his propaganda to be regarded seriously, why should he not take a turn in Germany and America where far more bellicose views prevail than in this country? Why should he concentrate himself on endeavouring to quench the feeble and flickering flame of patriotism which needs the utmost care and nursing if Great Britain is to keep her place among the Great Powers, to fulfil the obligations specific and moral she has undertaken and to save herself from the fate of other nations who have deservedly disappeared through listening to the craven counsels of people who were either too virtuous for this world or had some sinister purpose in misrepresenting the facts of the international situation?

The Young Turks

According to the accepted and orthodox creed unbroken harmony reigns among the Great Powers concerning the Near Eastern crisis, their sole object being the restoration of peace, to attain which they are prepared to forego all ulterior designs. Tremendous efforts have been made to impress the official view upon the Balkan States and upon Turkey, and we can all admire the unwearied labours of Sir Edward Grey and others to bring the London Conferences of the belligerents and the Ambassadors to a successful conclusion. Turkey has followed her usual dilatory tactics, confident in the belief that harmony was superficial, and her delegates advanced absurd pretexts for doing nothing. When the negotiators came to close grips the possession of Adrianople was seen to be the pivot of the difficulty. Naturally the victorious allies could not after all their sacrifices relinquish a prize which they regarded as virtually within their grasp. The Turks were equally tenacious, resolutely declining to entertain the idea of abandoning an ancient capital. They were, moreover, animated by an invincible contempt for their opponents, many of them believing, in spite of all that had happened, that the situation might yet be retrieved on the stricken field. Finally, the Powers were appealed to and agreed on a Collective Note to the Porte, recommending Turkey to cede Adrianople and to leave the other vital question of the Ægean Islands for settlement by them. There seems to have been serious delay in presenting the Note and the action of the German Ambassador in Constantinople remains obscure, while articles appeared in influential organs abroad calculated to encourage the Turks to believe that they still commanded powerful protection. Be the cause what it may, directly Kiamil Pasha, the Grand Vizier, had summoned and obtained the assent of the Grand Council of the Turkish Empire to make peace on the allies' terms, *i.e.* the surrender of Adrianople and the Ægean Islands, than a skilfully planned *coup d'état* was swiftly carried out at Constantinople by the Young Turks under Enver Bey. Kiamil Pasha was sent about his business and Shefket Pasha was installed as Grand Vizier, while Nazim Pasha was murdered.

It all went like clockwork and afforded scope for the making of enormous fortunes by the cosmopolitan Jews who had doubtless financed the *coup d'état* and were "in the know." As in the spacious days of the great Baron Marschall von Bieberstein, we must distinguish between official Germany, which has been the embodiment of correctitude, and the German Embassy in Constantinople acting in collusion with *la haute finance* in several capitals, and an outburst of significant articles in the Jewish Press of Berlin and Vienna. Influential and frequently inspired German newspapers ostentatiously announced that the German Ambassador in Constantinople had "watered down" the Collective Note of the Powers, while the Constantinople correspondent of the semi-official *Cologne Gazette* telegraphed to his paper immediately after the *coup d'état* that Colonel Enver Bey had spent two hours with the German Ambassador after midnight, and that that dignitary, Baron von Wangenheim, did not attend an important meeting of the Ambassadors. As a general rule official Germany does not care to have its hands forced by newspapers, nor is it wont to tolerate such a campaign as that which has been waged against the official policy, unless the Government intend to follow the pioneers who were preparing the way. To have the *Vossische Zeitung* and the *Berliner Tageblatt* making the running would be a humiliation for a proud and patriotic Power. In exposing these curious manœuvres the *Times* Berlin correspondent observes: "There is little wonder that people are asking who inspires a policy which seems equally detestable to the German Government and to the German Socialists." If the question is asked in Germany it is no less anxiously asked abroad. We believe that even the most competent circles are ignorant of anything beyond the superficial aspect of German policy, though if she has been at heart as pacific as on the outside it is because she was conscious of the solidarity of the Triple Entente, and was taken completely by surprise like other people by the achievements and potentialities of the Balkan League. Every one has been so hopelessly astray concerning both war and peace in the Near East that we easily resist the temptation to enrol ourselves among the prophets either as to

Gas v. Gunpowder

immediate or ultimate developments. We trust, though we have no hope, that the British Government will awaken to the possibilities of the near future. If we are governed by gas the rest of the world remains under the dominion of gunpowder.

President Poincaré

The French Presidential election decided on January 17 excited unusual, indeed universal, interest, and for once lookers-on saw most of the game. It had never been doubted abroad from the moment the distinguished French Prime Minister M. Raymond Poincaré announced his candidature that he would be elected, though some surprise was felt that a man of his ability and prospects should care to exchange the Premiership for an exalted office of such limited possibilities as the Presidency. However, it was suggested that M. Poincaré could do what somewhat humdrum predecessors had failed to do and develop the Presidency into what it always might have been. The election is held at Versailles, the electors consisting of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies, small constituencies which afford scope for unlimited lobbying. Every conceivable candidate was run against M. Poincaré, and there was a peculiarly ill-timed revival of the Dreyfus case, of which M. Millerand, the War Minister in the Poincaré Cabinet appears to have been the victim, as it was discovered on the eve of the election that employment had been found for the notorious Colonel Paty du Clam. Curiously enough a Socialist paper was able to publish and exploit the incident within a few hours of the document being signed among a thousand others by the War Minister. To counteract the possible effect of this episode in prejudicing M. Poincaré's chances M. Millerand resigned his portfolio and the French Army lost a Minister who may be described as the antithesis of our own great Carnot—Lord Haldane. Ultimately M. Poincaré's opponents concentrated on another of his colleagues, M. Pams, Minister of Agriculture, but at the election the ex-Premier triumphed at a Second Ballot by 483 votes to 296 accorded to his opponent. The one drawback to his triumph is the collapse of the Government over which he has presided with such signal distinction during a critical year, which performed the incalculable service of rescuing France from the clutches of M. Caillaux. M. Briand, the modern Demosthenes, is the new

French Premier, and M. Jonnart the new Foreign Minister—an exceptionally interesting appointment of a man outside ordinary Party politics with a high reputation and a strong character. Otherwise the Ministry is weaker than its predecessor. M. Bourgeois has retired from ill-health, and M. Delcassé's fruitful labours at the Admiralty are interrupted. M. Etienne, the new War Minister, deserves to be popular with the Army to which he is devoted, and he is a man of lofty patriotism. Prophets do not give the new Ministry a very long life, but the expected does not always happen, though M. Briand's course is surrounded by rocks.

A Water-logged Cabinet

YET another crisis has been sprung upon a jaded community, thanks to the futility of the Prime Minister. Upon one question, if only upon one, he was believed to be sound and steadfast. He had emphatically declared that the parliamentary enfranchisement of women—which would necessarily be followed by the parliamentary election of women and government by women—was equally bad for the sex and for the State, an opinion probably shared by nine men out of ten and by at least as large a proportion of women, who agree with Mr. Asquith that "to grant the political franchise to women in this country would be a political mistake of a very disastrous kind" (December 14, 1911). The Prime Minister had incurred a certain amount of obloquy and even physical discomfort at the hands of hysterical hooligans by his uncompromising attitude, but as he was expected to stand to his guns, he gained far more respect than he lost. Unfortunately, empty sacks cannot remain erect, and Mr. Asquith destroyed himself and forfeited the last lingering vestige of confidence by subsequently surrendering to the pressure of hen-pecked politicians and announcing that, although he retained his opinion that Petticoat Government would be a disaster, he would nevertheless promote that disaster and make himself responsible for it should a majority of the House of Commons desire it and embody any Woman Suffrage amendment in the Ministerial Franchise Bill. In this case Petticoat Government would become part and parcel of the Ministerial programme, to be given effect to under the provisions of the Parliament Act

without the electors, who have never been consulted as to this momentous revolution, being afforded the opportunity of expressing their views. It was a characteristic performance. Mr. Asquith has long since exhausted the resources of surprise, so no one has any right to be astonished at his childish and contemptible attitude. For a so-called responsible statesman commanding a great majority, of which he is more than ever master since the establishment of a "Single Self-paid Parliament," to declare a particular measure disastrous and yet to pledge himself to carry it should a sufficient number of leaderless followers wish it, is about as abject a proceeding as could be conceived.

Woman Suffrage

Everything is unique nowadays and the Premier's "latest" is as unique as other Ministerial performances. It is a weak man's escape from a dilemma, but like other weak actions it would appear to have added immensely to the difficulties both of the Prime Minister and his Party. Indeed, at the time of writing it is confidently stated by parliamentary experts that so impossible is the impasse that the Government have no choice but to drop their Franchise Bill, as they risk destruction owing to a divided Cabinet and a divided Party on the question of Woman Suffrage. We need scarcely say that there are few things more desirable than the downfall of our present Demagogues and the collapse of their schemes, and a Woman Suffrage agitation will not have been wholly useless should it contribute to this consummation. But that is its solitary merit and nothing should tempt Unionists, even for the sake of getting rid of the Government, to give any vote which might lead it to be supposed by any section of the community that the Unionist Party is a Woman Suffrage Party, or that any Unionist Government would under any circumstances be in a position to give votes to women. Otherwise, Unionists will ultimately find themselves in the same pitiable plight as the Radical Party, many of whose members have toyed with Woman Suffrage to pacify a handful of exasperated females who deem themselves cruelly deceived by professed friends of their movement. Let us declare on all possible occasions that we are dead against Woman Suffrage, and that no form of Woman Suffrage has any place in the

programme of the Unionist Party. Indeed, it will be necessary for our leaders to adopt an even stronger attitude, and to assert in the event of a general election that no one should give a Unionist vote on the assumption or pretext that he is thereby voting for Woman Suffrage. We have seen enough of late years of the evils of a divided Cabinet on this question, and we cannot afford to have another divided Cabinet, and those of our Front Benchers and others who may have thoughtlessly committed themselves to an impossible cause while continuing to give an academic vote for the sake of political consistency, must not be allowed to falsify the opinions of the overwhelming mass of the Unionist electorate by promoting any measure of Woman Suffrage, or by trying to paralyse the activities of that vital portion of the Party who will, under no circumstances whatsoever, consent to the establishment of any form of Petticoat Government, which has always been odious to self-respecting mankind, and is even more detestable to the great mass of sensible women of whom this community is still happily composed.

Gerrymandering

Of the Franchise Bill which Mr. Asquith tacitly invited the House of Commons to convert into a Woman Suffrage Bill, so that it may be placed on the Statute Book with other hateful Ministerial measures behind the backs of the people, we need only say that it is a vicious, vindictive piece of political gerrymandering, mainly designed to disfranchise Unionists and to multiply Radical electors, while all the outrageous anomalies of the present misdistribution of seats are to remain untouched because they are believed to favour the Coalition. The Bill changes from day to day, and what form it may be in when these pages appear no man can foretell. As an illustration of its general character we may take the treatment of the City of London, where an electorate of 30,000, constituting the greatest business centre in the world, is to be reduced by the abolition of the "occupation" clause to 3000 caretakers and nightwatchmen. Other business communities throughout the United Kingdom are to be similarly treated. The political complexion of the City of London might remain unaltered. There is no reason to suppose that a caretaker who is generally an honest and

responsible person, or a night watchman who is interested in maintaining law and order and has a keen eye for anything resembling rascality, would be likely to support supporters of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but as an exhibition of Radical malice this project fairly "takes the cake." Like other items in the Ministerial programme, it is charged with unconscious humour. Much capital has been made by the Cocoa and Chemical Press of the great "Free Trade" demonstrations in the City of London, at which wiseacres of the type of Lord Avebury, who is a great banker among beetle collectors and a great beetle-collector among bankers, to say nothing of Lord Balfour of Burleigh, speak the last word on the gospel of Cobden, or rather the fourteen professors of political economy. We are told that Free Trade is strong among bankers and financiers. As many of the latter are aliens we don't dispute it for a moment, though we believe that bankers have been maligned. Ministers are making a poor return to the Speyers and the Meyers, the Samuels, the Montagus, and the rest of them, by transferring their votes to their caretakers. Then we are threatened with the total disfranchisement of the Universities, who commit the unpardonable crime of electing Unionists, as no educated electorate cottons to Demagogues. On the whole, we should perhaps be grateful to the Prime Minister for precipitating a Woman Suffrage crisis in connection with such a measure, for, whichever of the several possible solutions under discussion as we write be adopted, the discredit of the Government deepens.

Ultra Vires

OUR readers will be wiser than we are as it is hopeless to hazard a guess as to the action of 670 legislators engaged in the absorbing occupation of "lobbying," of whom the large majority appear to have no settled conviction on any question, and are deprived of leadership on either side as both Front Benches are sharply divided. As between the rival merits of Sir Edward Grey's amendment to omit the word "male" from the Bill, so as to open the floodgates to an unlimited number of females, the Adult Suffrage Amendment of the Labour Party, "the Six Million Women Amendment," proposed by Mr. Dickinson, or the so-called "Conciliation Amendment" favoured by Unionist Suffragists, which is of a more limited character than the others, we need say nothing

accept this. The present Parliament has no shade of a shadow of authority from the electors of this country to carry out the portentous revolution for which these competitive groups are intriguing. Neither the Radical Party nor the Unionist Party informed the electors at either of the last two elections or at any preceding elections that in the event of their being returned to power the Government of the country would be transferred from men to women, either by easy stages or by a single stage. The whole business is utterly unconstitutional and scandalous, and we are amazed to find that Unionists, who make glib speeches about upholding the principles of the Constitution and denounce the Government for its countless violations of that Constitution, should lend themselves for a moment to any of the plots afoot for revolutionising the Government of this country and destroying the basis of society, without giving those from whom they derive their power an opportunity of expressing their opinion before an irrevocable decision is taken. We have no idea as to what the House of Commons will do. No one ever has, for the very simple reason that Members of Parliament haven't any idea themselves, and it is even alleged that a large number contemplate being attacked by influenza in order to avoid committing themselves one way or the other. Should the House of Lords have any say on the question it may be hoped that in the last resort it will tack on a Referendum clause submitting the question of Woman Suffrage to the electorate, and then we shall see what we shall see.

A Bombshell

"THE best-laid schemes of mice and men gang aft agley." As we go to press, the parliamentary kaleidoscope has taken another turn. We have never professed to penetrate its mysteries. All we do know is that Mandarins, whose single excuse for their general mismanagement of everything else is that parliamentary affairs are themselves all absorbing and engrossing, appear to be as inept on such matters as they are upon all questions of national defence, Imperial policy, and general administration. Prior to the discussion of the Franchise Bill (January 24), Mr. Bonar Law suggested to the Speaker that various proposed Government amendments "made such a material difference in the Bill that, in accordance with the practice

of this House, a new Bill should be introduced and read a second time." Mr. Bonar Law, as always, put his points admirably, and cited a previous ruling of Mr. Speaker Peel in reply to Sir William Harcourt in 1889, which caused the Government to withdraw a Tithe Rent Bill owing to drastic amendments proposed by Ministers which would practically have made it a new Bill. Mr. Lowther, while not entirely acquiescing in his predecessor's ruling, which he thought under the circumstances slightly "previous," as the amendments had not all been adopted, went on to say that he had *no right* to assume that the amendments of the present Franchise Bill now down on the paper would be inserted in that measure; all the more so as "the amendments have been changing from day to day." Therefore he ought not to pronounce any opinion with regard to them. He added, however, "There are also other amendments relating to Female Suffrage, which, of course, would make a huge difference if they were inserted, and at the present time Heaven only knows in what shape the Bill will emerge from Committee." He felt it would be improper "to give any ruling with regard to the particular point now, but for the general information of the House" he pointed out that the principle appeared to be clearly stated in the last edition of May. "Broadly speaking, it is this, that if such substantial amendments are made during the passage of a Bill in Committee as materially to affect the form and substance of the Bill in such a way as to make it for all practical purposes a new Bill, then it is necessary for that Bill to be withdrawn and a new Bill to be introduced. That is simply the general statement, and there I am afraid I must leave it for the present. We must wait and see in what position the Bill reappears."

One Man One Goat

THIS ruling cannot fail to have far-reaching consequences. *Inter alia* it completely shatters Mr. Asquith's reputation as a parliamentary pundit, and if he is not that he is nothing. Even the *Times* is compelled to admit that the ruling foreshadowed by the Speaker "is very difficult to reconcile with the Prime Minister's pledge to Suffragists, for it shows that Mr. Asquith's undertaking was almost certainly incompatible with the established practice of Parliament." It also strikes a deadly blow at the discreditable

conspiracy of hen-pecked parliamentarians to establish Petticoat Government in this country by a side wind. What the Government may do we have no idea and we do not very much care. The main point is that although parliamentary procedure has on the whole been drafted with a view to placing this country in the grip of a Caucus, there are limits to absolutism, and a Bill to enfranchise or disfranchise men cannot be converted at the whim of a vacillating Prime Minister who turns his back on his own convictions into a Bill to enfranchise women. Otherwise chaos would reign. A measure to establish Home Rule in Ireland could be converted into a Scottish Disestablishment Bill and vice versa. A Bill to give "One man one vote" might be transformed into a Bill to give "One man one goat." In fact, the whole parliamentary machine could easily be brought to a standstill, which might of itself not be such a very bad thing, but we may be sure that the country would in some way be made to pay the piper. It must also be said that low as Parliamentary government has been brought by a gang of unscrupulous adventurers no adequate substitute has yet been found. The prospect of Government by bureaucracy in the light of recent Post Office revelations has ceased to smile even on the Fabian Society. The semi-demented women at the head of the Suffragette movement threaten outrages in the event of their failure to terrorise the House of Commons into obeying their behests. We trust that on the first symptom of anything of the kind the criminals and their aiders and abettors will be transported to some desert island and there left to fight it out among themselves without the disturbing presence of man.

Mr. Harcourt's Speech

THE public services hitherto rendered by the Colonial Secretary, Mr. L. V. Harcourt, have been few and far between. He has generally displayed a genius for being in the wrong, and at more than one grave crisis he has associated himself with the most unpatriotic section of the Cabinet. Although Colonial Secretary he is a lifelong Little Englander, a passionate enemy of the British Navy and the British Army, and in fact of everything which makes for the greatness of the country. But the most perverted of mortals occasionally hit the nail on the head, and it must be admitted

that after the sentimental twaddle about Women Suffrage of the great "sob artist" (Mr. Lloyd George) and Sir Edward Grey—who is as foolish in home affairs as he is wise in foreign affairs—the incisive speech delivered in the House of Commons on January 24 by Mr. Harcourt was "rare and refreshing fruit." It was equally candid and courageous besides being extremely amusing—at any rate to that part of the House which occupies the Opposition Benches. Mr. Lloyd George had rashly hinted to a deputation of Suffragettes that the anti-Suffragettes in the Cabinet need not be taken very seriously and might be relied upon to surrender their convictions if adequately squeezed. This had evidently nettled Mr. Harcourt, a man of few convictions, who has, however, satisfied himself, like Mr. Asquith, that Woman Suffrage would be bad for women and bad for the State. So far he has shown no signs of hoisting the white flag. He effectually got home on his colleagues of the sentimental brigade, whose faces while he was speaking were better than a play. Though not himself an admirer of the theory of mandates, believing that Members of Parliament should be representatives rather than delegates, he at any rate had a clear and definite mandate on this matter, as his constituency knew that from the first time he stood for Parliament "I have been wholly and resolutely opposed to Female Suffrage." His mandate went beyond that. At the election of January 1910 he was opposed by the present Unionist Member for the Altrincham Division (Mr. Kebty-Fletcher), who was as strong an opponent of Female Suffrage as himself, "in fact it was the only point on which we agreed." A third candidate stood on that occasion "specially and avowedly in the interest of Woman Suffrage." Mr. Harcourt and the Unionist candidate jointly polled 11,800 votes, while their Suffrage opponent with the assistance of some Socialists secured 639. "I do not myself believe the result would be very different if any supporter of this amendment (Sir Edward Grey's proposal to delete the word 'male') were to seek the verdict of their constituents now upon this question alone." A few weeks ago a Member of Parliament, like a modern Don Quixote, had tried a tourney with a windmill, and after his defeat Mr. Lansbury had frankly admitted, "But for Votes for Women I should have walked over my opponent."

The Colonial Secretary's handling of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was drastic and resolute, besides being particularly interesting, as affording a glimpse of the affectionate relations subsisting among the professed "friends of the people." Mr. Harcourt did not care about the Referendum, nor did the advocates of Woman Suffrage, who had a shrewd suspicion as to its probable result. But in 1907 during a Parliament which contained a far larger number of supporters of "Votes for Women" than the present the Chancellor of the Exchequer told a deputation which pressed this policy upon him, "no Government could deal with such a gigantic question till it had been before the country in a definite and concrete form." "My right hon. friend" had never attempted to give it that concrete form. "His argument, strong as it was then, surely has redoubled force to-day after the introduction and passage of the Parliament Act." On the same occasion the Chancellor of the Exchequer added, "He could not conceive of a revolution of this character being introduced into our constitution without the opinion of the country being asked upon it definitely." The Colonial Secretary caustically added, "I hope that by his vote upon this amendment he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) will carry out this constitutional conviction." About a year ago Mr. Lloyd George said, "There is only one way to get a mandate—each member should get it from his own constituency. Well, as I said just now, only one has tried it, and his example and experience afford no encouragement to others." Again, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said this: "It can hardly be said that the Members of Parliament pledged to Female Suffrage had really consulted their constituents about it, because it has never really been discussed by the electors in the way that previous extensions of the Franchise had been debated." Here was an admission, according to the Colonial Secretary, "by one of the leading advocates of Female Suffrage that neither he nor any of his friends have any mandate from the constituencies which would justify the addition of this proposal, under present circumstances, to the Bill (the Franchise Bill) which is before the Committee." While disbelieving in any form of women's parliamentary suffrage, Mr. Harcourt declared that many women were admirably fitted

Colonial Office v. Treasury

for the work of local administration, in which they already shared through the municipal vote, and he hoped that their numbers and powers might be extended. "I think it is a pity they do not make more use of *the local government votes which they now* possess. I do not know why they do not stand oftener for local bodies, or why they are so seldom elected when they do. It seems to indicate that the opinion of even a mixed electorate does not find them well qualified even for that amount of public life."

C.O. *v.* F.O.

THEN the Colonial Secretary turned his batteries upon his colleague at the Foreign Office (Sir Edward Grey), who was responsible for the proposal to delete the word "male" before the word "person" in the opening words of the first clause of the Franchise Bill which the Committee was now discussing. This was really a proposal for the enfranchisement of all women, the result of which at a rough calculation would be the addition of 11,000,000 women to an electorate which might contain only 10,000,000 men. "This is in practice the result at which my right hon. friend the Foreign Secretary aims, though for tactical reasons he may at this moment not think it wise to disclose his whole hand." This sentence has peculiar value because it finally disposes of all those theatrical displays of mock indignation on the part of Mr. Asquith and his colleagues when they are accused of pursuing ulterior objects under cover of tactical manœuvres. We now have it on the unimpeachable authority of the Colonial Secretary that his artless colleague at the Foreign Office has been afflicted by the common disease. "He believes in the equality of the sexes, he admits no deficiency in the female mind. He is much too honest, therefore, really to disguise the end at which he aims. He has said, 'He can see nothing but gain in the full participation of women in the Franchise,' but he admitted that 'Adult Suffrage at one stroke was more than the country would at present accept.'" So they would doubtless find Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Lyttelton "clinging to that business end of the wedge which is dear to the heart of every timid and tentative reformer. Why these counsels of fear? The Foreign Secretary need not worry. He is not proposing to consult the country on this Amendment. He

intends to use the Parliament Act in order to pass this proposal which has never been before the electors. Here is his chance for the exhibition of real virtue and of giving a vote according to his conscience." The reader must continually bear in mind that this is not a speech by Mr. Bonar Law on Mr. Asquith such as excites the spluttering fury of the *Westminster Gazette*; it is the opinion of one of Mr. Asquith's colleagues of another. Mr. Harcourt cruelly continued: "A year ago he (Sir Edward Grey) read with approval to a public meeting a letter of Lord Haldane's in which the Lord Chancellor said, 'How can we insist any longer on a supposed natural disqualification of women for government?' That seems to me to carry us to the logical corollary of their presence in this House and in this Debate."

Deadly Thrusts

THE roasting of Sir Edward Grey continued. "The Foreign Secretary said 'he would not speak of that to-day.' No, probably very wisely not; but he knows that it is the essential proposal of to-morrow. I believe in Sweden it inevitably has been accepted. (An hon. member: 'Why not?') Yes, why not? The Foreign Secretary has been for more than seven years in absolute control of the Foreign Office. Why, holding the views he does, has he not tried some experiments to convince us in the domain in which he reigns supreme? Why have we no women as ambassadors, as consuls, or even as Foreign Office clerks? They might have added to the gaiety of nations, but his courage seems to have failed when he reached the sticking-point." Needless to say the House of Commons, or rather that portion of it confronting the Government, rocked with laughter at this deadly home thrust. Mr. Harcourt regarded Woman Suffrage as an evil and should vote against all amendments designed to enact it, though Adult Suffrage was the only one combining justice and logic. He returned to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had recently announced that he would support the so-called Norwegian system and that only. "He (Mr. Lloyd George) wants, in his own words, 'a broad democratic franchise for millions of women,' but he proposes Adult Suffrage to men and something much less than Adult Suffrage to women." Under Adult Suffrage eleven

millions of women would be enfranchised, but under the Norwegian system only seven millions.

> He [Mr. Lloyd George] wants us to disfranchise or to keep unenfranchised four or five millions of women. Why? Who are they? On the day that the Insurance Bill became an Act, the right hon. gentleman made an eloquent speech upon this subject. He said: "Sickness and invalidity had been lifted into the sphere of law. Why should women cease to be interested in them when they go there?" He [Mr. George] said the Insurance Act affected seven million married women and four million women workers. He professed his anxiety to consult the opinion of the four millions of working women, but he favours this proposal which will give him the opinion of only seven out of the eleven millions. Why does he exclude the remaining four millions of workers? Surely not because they are mainly female domestic servants. He recently received a deputation of female domestic servants, and he said afterwards that "their observations were relevant, emphatic, and sound." Why, then, does he wish to deprive them of the vote? "Their interests have been lifted into the sphere of law." He has not hesitated to take their threepences; does he fear now to take their opinion?

This is one of Mr. Bonar Law's best in the mouth of Mr. Harcourt, who proceeded: "It is no use hon. members cringing or shrinking from the logical result of their action. They must face the music and accept the effect of their principles." This was another good right and left. It was impossible to consider the question entirely apart from the methods recently adopted by those clamorous for the vote.

Arson v. Argument

MR. HARCOURT said: "The attempt to burn my home—or rather the children's wing of my home—has not, I need not say, affected my mind or altered my opinion on the subject. The assumption, indeed, that arson is a substitute for argument is a poor proof of the judgment of those by whom it is made . . . but the adoption and still more the approval of methods of violence and crime by those who are demanding what they consider to be their rights is at least an indication of the type of mental balance we may expect if they are to become our electors. If it were a fact—or if it were generally believed—that the attainment of the vote had been secured by these methods, then there would be a grave temptation and encouragement to women in the future, even after they had obtained the vote but found themselves in a minority on any public question, to revert to those methods which would seem to them to have been efficacious on a former occasion." This

brought the Colonial Secretary once more to the position of "my right hon. friend the Foreign Secretary," who at one time "took a very serious view of these manifestations. He has stated publicly that the basis of his support for the policy is that 'the introduction of women's votes into politics will act as a humanising and civilising influence on public life.' No wonder then he stands aghast at broken windows, damaged letters, false fire alarms, cut telegraph wires, obstructed railway signals, at incendiarism and hatchets. These do not represent his idea of 'humanity' or 'civilisation.' He has, indeed, frankly stated that 'the use of violent methods must paralyse the argument that when women have votes they will be an orderly and wholesome influence.'" He said more than that. He has said that he "cannot successfully advocate the vote when its demand is accompanied by acts of violence," and he added: "it was repugnant to his feelings and waste of time to give active support to Female Suffrage under these circumstances." But as the Colonial Secretary sarcastically observed, "appetite seems to grow with eating. These acts have continued and have increased in violence in the fourteen months which have elapsed since he (Sir Edward Grey) uttered those lofty sentiments. On November 30, 1911, he (Sir E. Grey) wrote: 'It cannot be expected that people like myself who are colleagues and friends of the Prime Minister can give active support to any movement while some of its supporters make him the object of their demonstrations.'" But, as Mr. Harcourt insisted, these persons had never ceased making the Prime Minister the object of their insults. Nevertheless, "my right hon. friend the Foreign Secretary, having failed to quell the violence he deplored, will come here on Monday to palliate its commission by assisting its perpetrators."

Counsel of Cowardice

Mr. Harcourt concluded the one useful and effective speech of his life by a few wholesome words which Unionists no less than their opponents would do well to take to heart, and they are particularly addressed to those squeezable mugwumps who are to be found in all companies and who abound in disproportionate numbers at the present day. "It is said by some that if women want the vote

they must have it. I do not believe it is true that the majority of women want the vote. Even if they did, that would be a counsel of cowardice. There are many things, too, that man may want, but if you believe them to be bad for the State we do not give them merely because the man breaks our windows or our heads. If you are convinced that the claim is just, that the reward will be adequate, that the result will be beneficial, you have a right to vote for it if you think you have a mandate. But how many of you think all or any of these things? There are too many, I am afraid, in this House who think themselves tied by pledges which were extorted not by reason but by cajolery; pledges which are rather an expression of civility than of conviction. You wish, some of you, to make woman man's master rather than his mate. You may be right. I am profoundly convinced you are wrong; and I am sure that if you attain this end you will contribute neither to the happiness of the home nor the safety of the country." No wonder that immediately after this caustic and crushing criticism of "my dear colleagues" on the part of one of the principal members of the Government a meeting of the Cabinet should have been hastily summoned—though of course we are told that it had nothing to do with the question of Woman Suffrage—which was followed by conflicting rumours, though we may accept Mr. Herbert Samuel's statement that no one will resign. The Postmaster-General should be an expert on such matters. We are told that Ministers "acutely feel their position." Well they may. The country also acutely feels its position in being saddled with such a Ministry, and were there any shred of self-respect left in Parliamentary Government Mr. Asquith would insist on placing his resignation in the hands of the Sovereign whom he has continually deceived and ask to be relieved of the Premiership which he has dragged in the dust. At least he should seek an opportunity of consulting the country whose confidence he has grossly betrayed. When we say the Government can't go on it doesn't mean that they won't go on, it only means that they can't go on according to the canons of decency; but, then, for decency the Cabinet has never shown the slightest regard. Having heard the Colonial Secretary's real opinion of the Foreign Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, we are

surely entitled to know what they think of him, after which we should like to hear Mr. John Burns and Mr. McKenna on Messrs. George and Churchill and vice versa; and while we are about it we may as well know what the late Lord Chancellor thinks of his successor, and what they all think of Messrs. Samuel, Isaacs and Montagu. Since Mr. Harcourt's speech and the Speaker's ruling, the Franchise Bill has gone by the board. A Woman Suffrage Bill is promised to-morrow—but to-morrow never comes.

Home Rule

AMIDST all this hubbub we must not forget that a preposterous Home Rule Bill has been passed by the House of Commons and is now being debated in the House of Lords. The Third Reading was carried by the usual mechanical majority after the familiar speeches which the country neither hears nor reads. It is heartily sick of the whole question, which does not mean, as Radicals pretend to imagine, that the electors of Great Britain are prepared to become a party to the betrayal of Ulster and the dismemberment of the United Kingdom. Their indifference is due to their ignorance of the possibilities of the Parliament Act. They cannot believe that any Government would attempt to place loyal Northern Ireland under the dominion of traitorous Molly Maguires; while the great majority laughed to scorn the idea that the British Army can be employed without the specific consent of the British people to thrust the men of Ulster out of the United Kingdom, which means a bloody civil war. The idea is widespread that there must and will be a General Election before Home Rule comes into operation, and that is why so little interest has been taken in the discussions in the House of Commons; we shall be surprised if those in the House of Lords excite the faintest flicker of interest, all the more as our only Second Chamber is regarded as having practically committed political suicide by the historic scuttle of 1911, when under an empty threat of swamping the peerage which could never have been carried out, and to preserve a paper position and paper privileges, the vast army of modern creations of both parties mobilised themselves behind timid leaders and, with the assistance of a plutocracy-ridden Press, executed that great retreat from Moscow destined to exercise the same disastrous

influence on the fortunes of the House of Lords as the spoiled retreat from Moscow exercised on the fate of Napoleon. For that great man it was the beginning of the end. Similarly it will be found that the capitulation over the Parliament Bill was the beginning of the end of the British House of Lords, and the only remaining question of interest for serious people is: What can be put in its place? Peers may talk with the tongue of men and of angels; they may turn the Home Rule Bill inside out and upside down, and repeat everything which has been said against it in the House of Commons under the pathetic delusion that the world is sitting in the gallery and that every newspaper reader is panting to peruse the columns of oratory which as we go to press are flowing from either side of the Woolsack.

Scotland and Germany

But the thought that is uppermost in the minds of every one who stops to think is, what is the use of all these admirable and unanswerable attacks on an outrageous Bill from noble lords who played the game of the Government in 1911 and allowed themselves to be jockeyed into swallowing an equally outrageous Bill of which, as they well knew, the main object was that Mr. Asquith might be able to fulfil his debt of dishonour and "toe the line" to Mr. John Redmond by introducing the very measure which is now being thundered at "across the Corridor"? We share the prevalent view that the Coalition will be unable to subject Belfast to Dublin, not on account of any speeches that may be made in either House of Parliament, but because the Coalition has lost its driving power and will be totally unable to cope with the resolute resistance which will be provoked by any attempt to make the men of Ulster lick the boots of the Dillons, the Devlins and the Redmonds. Loyal Ulster can no more be persuaded to submit even if a majority of the British electorate betrayed them than Scotland would consent to be handed over to Germany against her will on the *ipse dixit* of the rest of the United Kingdom. We have little fear of that dilemma arising, because whenever the country secures the opportunity of being consulted Mr. Asquith and all his works will disappear, and the longer Dissolution is postponed the greater will be the Radical *debâcle*. Ministers are already in a worse position than Mr. Balfour's Government

in [illegible]. Some of the Premier's colleagues are believed to be courting disaster for fear of the daily growing disgrace into which they are falling and which might produce a veritable landslide. But £5000 a year is an irresistible temptation to luxurious and extravagant politicians, while £400 a year counts for not a little in the outlook of the rank and file of the Coalition.

Postmaster-General's Humiliation

THE *Westminster Gazette* (January 25) fears that "amid the many excitements of the week the proceedings before the Marconi Committee may escape full notice." We share this fear, coupled with the hope that the entire proceedings of the Marconi Committee throughout the month should be noted by the public, and we can only express our regret that the *Westminster Gazette* has played so insignificant a part in keeping them to the fore. We may fairly claim without arrogance to have done whatever we could, having published a Marconi article every month since September. Naturally we rejoice to observe that our view of the Agreement is spreading. We have never pretended to be pioneers in this business, but followed the *Outlook* and Mr. W. R. Lawson, who had made this subject his own. We publish an article elsewhere referring to the latest phase of the Ministerial mess, entitled "A Radical 'Panama'?" to which we would direct the reader's attention as it contrasts the situation to-day, when the Agreement seems to be knocked out—though we must be prepared for further surprises—with what it was when the campaign of education began and the hope of getting a disastrous bargain reconsidered was dim. We claim to have justified the immense importance and unusual space devoted to this particular transaction, which is now seen to embrace questions going to the root of democratic government. The Select Committee has so far declined to kowtow to the Government, and Mr. Herbert Samuel was severely snubbed when he tried to bully it into withdrawing the sensible proposal that an independent Committee of Experts should be forthwith appointed to report upon the various wireless systems now on trial. The Postmaster-General's conduct may be gathered by comparing his lecture to the Select Committee with his subsequent abject surrender. He told the Committee (January 13) with all the lordly insouciance of the jack-in-office,

"I foresee the greatest possible difficulty in selecting the individuals to form this Committee if it is to be independent both of the Government and all the various wireless systems, and is at the same time to consist of men who are really experts in wireless telegraphy, whose opinion would carry the greatest authority. I do not know whether the Committee have in their mind any particular names, but if so I shall be very glad indeed to consider them *should the Committee propose to go on with this proposition* [our italics]; but for my part, after consulting with others, I can only say that the selection of such a Committee would be a task of the most formidable magnitude." Mr. Samuel the supercilious had completely overdone the Mandarin. The Committee replied by presenting a special Interim Report advising the appointment of a technical Committee, and a few hours later in reply to a question by the Chairman of the Committee, the Postmaster-General brazenly informed the House of Commons: "These recommendations, in their present form, substantially meet the representations which were made to the Committee on behalf of the Government, and the Government will be glad to give immediate effect to them."

Marconi Company's Withdrawal

THE long-winded and disingenuous objections to the appointment of such a Committee speedily vanished, and a few days later it was constituted as follows: Mr. Justice Parker, Chairman; Mr. W. Duddell, F.R.S., Consulting Engineer and President of the Institute of Electrical Engineers; Dr. R. T. Glazebrook, F.R.S., Director of the National Laboratory since 1899; Sir Alexander Kennedy, F.R.S., a past President of the Institute of Civil Engineers and of the Institute of Mechanical Engineers; Mr. James Swinburne, F.R.S., an ex-President of the Institution of Electrical Engineers and President of the Faraday Society. Why did Mr. Herbert Samuel try and mislead the Select Committee by conjuring up difficulties which only existed in his own imagination? It was apparently the easiest thing in the world to get five Fellows of the Royal Society, all eminent experts, presided over by a very distinguished judge. Why, we may ask, did not Mr. Herbert Samuel of his own initiative appoint such a Committee before embarking on his incredible wireless negotiations? Echo

answers Why? to these and many other questions. Why did Mr. Herbert Samuel say one thing to the Committee and another thing to the House of Commons? Why is the country afflicted by Ministers of the Samuel type? Meanwhile the Marconi Company wrote a somewhat unimpressive letter to the Postmaster-General asking to be relieved from their Contract. We trust their demand will be immediately acceded to. The opening sentence was highly suggestive as to the relations between the Company and the Post Office, and the expectations of the former as to what an omnipotent bureaucrcay could do. Says Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, Managing Director of the Marconi Company, in this letter dated "Marconi House, Strand, January 15" (*i.e.* two days after Mr. Samuel's failure to bluff the Committee), "When I submitted to your Department the Tender of March 7, my Company contemplated that the Agreement would be drawn up forthwith and that within a very few weeks it would have been submitted to Parliament and ratified." A very natural expectation on the part of the Company, and, we may add, within an ace of fulfilment.

Where are Ministers?

As the *Westminster Gazette* informs its readers of "the ignoble collapse of practically the whole of the serious charges made in this unscrupulous campaign that has been waged against the Government," there must be much virtue in that elastic word "practically." Our readers shall judge for themselves as to the accuracy of the *Westminster Gazette*, though we should prefer to have postponed further controversy on this part of the case until after the present writer has given evidence before the Select Committee; but as it is impossible to ascertain at the time of writing when that may be, such statements cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged, as they are calculated, if not designed, to mislead the public. Not the least amazing feature of an amazing affair is the conduct of certain of his Majesty's Ministers, from whom passionate protestations of ignorance and innocence concerning the great Marconi gamble were made in the House of Commons so long ago as October 11. The unsophisticated might have imagined that men in their positions would have insisted on being heard by the Committee at the outset in order that they might

dissipate the atmosphere of suspicion and clear their own fair fame. We are, of course, aware that Committees settle their own procedure and arrange the order of the witnesses, but no Committee could have *refused the demand of, say, the Chancellor* of the Exchequer to come with his pass books, his bankers and his brokers, any more than they could have refused similar demands from his colleagues whose names have been rightly or wrongly mentioned in connection with this affair. It is worth recalling what was said in the House of Commons on October 11, in view of the challenge of the *Westminster Gazette*. As all the world knows, Mr. Lloyd George avoided making any denial of what he described as "these rumours, these sinister rumours, that have been passing from one foul lip to another behind the backs of the House." He preferred to get up a gratuitous quarrel with "my friend Lansbury." Then Sir Rufus Isaacs, the Attorney-General and member of the Cabinet, who occupies an unfortunate position in this matter owing to an indiscretion and his relationship to Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, who has been connected with many companies besides the Marconi Company, gave a positive denial so far as it went, but it did not cover the ground; while on the other hand that of the Postmaster-General, whose "great speech" is now seen to have been the usual official mystification, gave far too comprehensive a denial, as he professed to be acquainted with the private affairs of all his colleagues.

A Dissolution?

THE main point, however, is that Ministers professed themselves delighted at the appointment of a Select Committee before which they were literally panting to appear. Let us quote the Postmaster-General (House of Commons, October 11, 1912): "This Committee which will be appointed will enquire into every aspect of this question, and Members of the Government will be most ready to appear before it. Every Member of the House may have full confidence that while every part of this transaction will come under the search-light of examination, it will be shown that there is no uncleanliness in any quarter." These declarations are three and a half months old, and we should like to know what efforts Ministers have made in the interval to give effect to them. They must be wonderfully insensitive to have stood aside all this time on the plea that

they had not been summoned before the Committee. All the more as they must have read the Minutes of Evidence, which put a worse complexion on the transaction as a whole than it bore at the time of the Debate. In the light of the official evidence the Marconi Agreement becomes more incomprehensible than ever. We trust that there may be no more shirking in this business and that at the earliest possible moment the Postmaster-General's categorical pledge will be fulfilled, so that the mists of suspicion surrounding *l'affaire* Marconi may be dissipated once and for all. Lord Robert Cecil in the debate already quoted expressed the view of the man in the street when he said:

> It would be folly for us to conceal from ourselves that there is, for some reason difficult to understand, a general recrudescence of talk of corruption in all sorts of directions. We hear first this story and then that story about some public man. That is a disastrous state of things Here we have a set of charges; let us take care that they are investigated and that the investigation is so full and complete that there is nothing like hushing up, that those accused will emerge from the enquiry not only without a stain upon their characters, but under circumstances which will show that the charges are nothing but the malignant growth of a diseased imagination.

And so say all of us. But Ministers have not gone the right way to work to restore public confidence, and it is rumoured among politicians who are not precisely fools that the country might conceivably be plunged into a Dissolution which would put a stopper on all further discussion of several highly inconvenient topics. Though doubtless animated by the best intention in the world, the Postmaster-General inflicted considerable moral damage on the Government by his egregious performance before the Select Committee on January 13.

The Unionist Crisis

THE mess into which muddled-headed Ministers have got themselves has completely overshadowed the crisis in the Unionist Party which would otherwise have been a prominent topic of the past month. As our readers are aware the *National Review* has for many years, and long before the question became a burning one in 1903, steadily advocated the policy of Imperial Preference, which, in spite of much confusion of thought and language, means precisely what it says, namely, that the various members of the British Empire shall *prefer* dealing with one another rather than with com-

petitive communities, and that that preference shall take the form of mutual concessions in each other's markets in the shape of lower tolls than those levied on imports from outside the Empire. This admirable doctrine was first proclaimed at a Colonial Conference a quarter of a century ago, on the occasion of the first Jubilee of Queen Victoria. It was a complete novelty to the home Government and was met by the Conservatives then in power as any new idea is usually met by home-keeping politicians whose knowledge of the word is confined to these islands. However, the Colonies, now, the Dominions, having grasped the principle, never relaxed their hold of it and have had the satisfaction of gradually seeing an immense body of opinion in the Mother Country converted to their view. They have, moreover, put it into effective practice. In Preference lies one of the most promising ways of consolidating our scattered Empire. The immense merit of the principle, apart from its commercial and political effects, which are incalculable, is its extreme simplicity. It involves the minimum of interference with the various local fiscal systems, and it can be equally well grafted on to a Protectionist tariff as on to a tariff for Revenue, because Preference can be given without imposing heavy duties. But it stands to reason that it cannot be grafted on to a cosmopolitan Cobdenite system founded on the dogma that in a commercial sense kinsmen must be treated as foreigners and that no concessions may be made to the former of which the latter shall not enjoy the benefit. For that reason Preference involves a change in the obsolete fiscal system of this country, which on all grounds is long overdue. If we were but an island instead of being the centre of a world-wide Empire we could not remain the common dumping-ground of the surplus goods of our industrial competitors, and one of the great services rendered by Mr. Chamberlain in raising the Imperial issue was to compel Englishmen to examine the condition of their own country, the outstanding economic features of which so far as they affect the great mass of our people of late years have been the increasing cost of living, stagnant wages, an immense amount of unemployment and partial-employment conditions which have not unnaturally provoked portentous strikes. Whereas in more progressive communities under common-sense fiscal systems, wages have risen at least as much as prices, and there has been infinitely less misery.

While people are leaving our shores by tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands, Germany is able to find employment for a vastly greater population and emigration has been brought to a standstill. Again, the savings of the mass of the German people as compared with British savings are equally eloquent and conclusive. There are stable and encouraging elements in the industrial condition of Germany; there is something very rotten in that of Great Britain. So much so that the burden of proof lies with the defenders of our established system rather than with its assailants. Cobdenism suits Radical plutocrats, many of whom enjoy one or other form of Protection, or derive huge incomes from investments or industries in Protectionist countries. The Cadburys, the Brünners, the Monds, the Speyers, &c., have prospered amazingly. But it is fatal to the people, and its days are numbered. Free Imports will either be abolished by the Unionist Party, or if they linger much longer by the way it will be abolished by the Radicals when they have shaken themselves free of some of their reactionary pedants educated at Balliol, the nursery of prigs. The question is whether a necessary and inevitable reform of our insular fiscal system shall be merely insular, or whether it shall form part of the greater policy with which Mr. Chamberlain's name is imperishably associated. We stand, as always, for the greater policy, the wisdom of which can neither be affected by the chameleons of Printing House Square, who say one thing to-day and another thing to-morrow, nor by pusillanimous politicians. We rejoice to know that, in spite of the panic which momentarily overtook our Party in Parliament a few weeks ago, causing an overwhelming majority of them to demand the half-masting of the Imperial Flag, one statesman at any rate refused to participate in the stampede, and by standing out performed an infinitely great service not only to the Empire whose cause he personifies, but likewise to the Party to which he belongs. We are privileged to publish the courageous and convincing speech which has so greatly enhanced Mr. Austen Chamberlain's reputation. It will be read throughout the Dominions with the keenest admiration and approval, not merely on account of the spirit animating the speaker, but also because it will be regarded as a token that, though parties may temporarily lose their heads,

Mr. Austen Chamberlain

when the inevitable reaction against this attack of "nerves" sets in there will not be wanting men to carry out "the first constructive work of the Unionist Party," as defined and advocated during the last seven years to which the Party is bound by every obligation of honour unless we are all to become Little Englanders. As Mr. Borden said in his historic speech, trade and defence are inseparable elements in Imperial consolidation, and even if they desired, which we are convinced the immense majority of the Unionist Party do not, to water their Imperial wine, they would find it impossible at a time when Canada has set such a splendid example of the larger Patriotism to reduce Tariff Reform from an Imperial to a merely insular issue, viz. as to whether we shall put ten or fifteen per cent. on German manufactured goods.

A Press Trust

All the Dominions have given preferences to the Mother Country, the value of which even the members of the present Government have been compelled to recognise, but we cannot hope to preserve one-sided preference, and it is essential to the maintenance of the immense advantages that we now enjoy that there should be mutuality. In the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, we should give concession for concession, and we have no doubt that Unionist policy will ultimately be worked out on these lines. We keenly regret the temporary set-back caused by the recent scuttle, as also the moral damage sustained by the Unionist Party through its shabby treatment of Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Bonar Law. We suspect if we got to the bottom of the plot we should find persons enjoying a minimum of confidence in the Unionist Party who seek a change of Leadership with the deluded idea that they would advance themselves.* They are the same persons who organised the Fly-hard movement in the House of Lords with suicidal consequences to that assembly. We are also bound to express our regret that any Irish Unionists should have been associated with any stampede, because stampedes are incompatible with the cause of Ulster, which is the cause of the Union. Still more do we regret that when Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Bonar Law, the appointed and trusted Leaders of the Unionist Party, who had carefully defined our policy at the Albert Hall,

were presented with the Party Memorandum, which was a farrago of nonsense, being a demand by the petrified rank and file that the Generals should change their plan of campaign—we cannot help regretting that they did not carry out their original intention of summoning a meeting of the Party, and seeing the memorialists somewhere first. After a few hours' chaos we should have found ourselves in an infinitely stronger position than before. It may be that the position of the Government is so wretched that nothing can keep it in power, though how the limpets are to be cleared out of office is less obvious. At any rate those who preach Preference because they believe in it as a condition precedent to effective Imperial consolidation will not abate one jot or tittle of their faith in that cause, and will fight for the whole policy. They will not take their marching orders from Fleet Street funkers who, having made no serious attempt to understand or to expound any political ideal, suddenly pronounce it to be "unpopular." To such the Empire is not a creed but a cry. One particularly bright spot in the recent Unionist crisis was the revolt against the Press Trust which seeks to dominate the Unionist Party, although it is alleged to be to some extent in the hands of Radicals—a fact which explains many otherwise inexplicable mysteries. In this revolt the *Morning Post*, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the *Observer* and the *Daily Express* greatly distinguished themselves, and it may be hoped that other free and independent organs will follow suit. The Press Trust is far better employed in booming Mr. Winston Churchill than in lecturing the Unionist Party on questions of policy. It is rumoured that Mr. Hearst, the creator of the American Yellow Press, has obtained some hold over English newspapers, but we have been unable to ascertain any particulars. If any of our readers can help us in the matter we shall be grateful.

R. P. E.

THE Radical Plutocracy Enquiry have taken an office at 50 St. Stephen's House, Westminster, London, S.W., where all communications should be addressed to the Secretary. We venture to congratulate this promising movement on its preliminary achievements. All decent, self-respecting men are thoroughly nauseated by the repulsive hypocrisies of a professedly democratic Coalition which is largely financed by

multi-millionaires of alien extraction, some of whom appear to have taken up their abode in this country not only for what they can make out of it under the sweating system of Free Trade, but in order to inflict the maximum injury on Great Britain for the sake of the beloved Fatherland. They are a positive danger to the State. They secretly buy up British newspapers unbeknown to their readers, and have organised a regular Potsdam Press in conjunction with disloyal Englishmen not infrequently of Hebrew extraction. They have attached themselves to the Coalition to whom every German spy is welcome, and in return for debauching the democracy by unlimited campaign funds they are loaded with "honours" so-called by grateful party managers. The Press, generally speaking, is silent on this as on other vital questions touching the Radical Plutocracy, because newspaper proprietors have unfortunately developed a positive passion for peerages, though some are content to be fobbed off with baronetcies and knighthoods; and with the Managing Director of *Reynolds's Newspaper* a member of his Majesty's Privy Council there is hope for all. An independent body like the Radical Plutocracy Enquiry supplies a long-felt want, and already a Prime Minister who sticks at nothing is learning that the pollution of the Fountain of Honour has been carried dangerously far. Early in November the R.P.E. circulated preliminary and searching questions concerning the Niagara of Honours since the party of progress captured the government of the country seven years ago. These questions were not only brought to the special notice of his Majesty's Ministers but likewise to all members of both Houses of Parliament, whatever their politics. Notice was likewise delivered to Radical recipients of "honours" that their dignities were about to be investigated, and the following letter was addressed to persons likely to be able to supply the necessary information:

SIR,—I. Are there any Radical millionaires or quasi-millionaires or Radicals who pass for being plutocrats in your neighbourhood, or have you any knowledge of such persons elsewhere?

II. Have any of them received any "Honours" since the Radical Party came into office in November 1905, particularly hereditary Honours, such as peerages or baronetcies, though information is also desirable concerning Radical Privy Councillors, Radical Knights, and Radical J.P.s?

III. Are there any recipients of "Honours," especially of hereditary Honours,

on record as opponents to the hereditary principle, or as assailants of the House of Lords and of "privilege" generally ?

IV. How far have those Radicals upon whom "Honours" have been bestowed been associated with any public work, whether naval, military, social, scientific, philanthropic, &c. &c. ? Have any of them performed conspicuous acts of generosity ?

V. Have they, or any of them, rendered any services to the State, county, or municipality, except such as could be fairly described as "party services" ?

VI. Can you offer any explanation of their being singled out for distinction at the hands of the Crown, except that they are reputed to be wealthy men who may conceivably have contributed to the Radical Party funds ?

VII. Have any of them altered or modified their opinions, or in any way abated their party zeal, since they acquired hereditary or other Honours ?

N.B.—Enquirers should remember thatabsolute accuracy is the chief desideratum in order that this enquiry may serve its purpose. When they are in doubt as to the correct answers to any of these questions, or to other questions to be subsequently circulated, they should make it a point of honour to give the subjects of the enquiry (*i.e.* the Radical plutocracy) the benefit of the doubt.

Answers to the above questions should be sent as soon as possible to the above address.

Yours faithfully,

THE HON. SECRETARY RADICAL PLUTOCRACY ENQUIRY.

New Year's Honours

THAT the efforts of the R.P.E. have not been wasted may be gathered from the New Year's Honours list, which has caused weeping and gnashing of teeth among Radical plutocrats, as from their point of view it bore painful contrast to previous lists and their own expectations. In the first place there were only two new Peers, one of whom had actually rendered some service to the State—namely, Sir George Sydenham Clarke, ex-Governor of Bombay, who, it will be remembered, was exiled to that high office some years ago because he refused to continue saying "ditto" to Sir John Fisher, the autocrat of "the Admiralty" of those days and the boss of the Defence Committee. According to all accounts the Defence Committee's loss has been Bombay's gain, for Sir George Clarke is described by unprejudiced persons as the best Governor of Bombay of recent years. No one can have failed to notice that during his Governorship Bombay has been singularly free from the unrest and anarchy conspicuous elsewhere in India. At last we have something for which to thank Sir John Fisher. Men sometimes build wiser than they know. The other peerage, if somewhat mysterious,

is not purely plutocratic. Sir George Kemp has played many parts in his time and has boxed the political compass. He recently retired from the House of Commons because he could not stomach the Home Rule Bill and because, as he told his constituents, he hated politics. He has now been recalled to the hereditary branch of the legislature, where he will have an opportunity of destroying the principal Ministerial measure of the Session. There is a fine detachment about this honour which exasperates *Reynolds's Newspaper*—the demi-semi-official organ of the Coalition. Sir George Kemp used to be a first-class cricketer, but if cricket is his passport to the Peerage, the public naturally ask themselves why the claims of Dr. W. G. Grace have been so long overlooked. The Privy Council is momentarily spared further humiliation, as Lord Desart and Sir John Simon, the Solicitor-General, are the only new recruits to that much afflicted body. The new Baronets comprise *inter alia* a Unionist Member of Parliament, a Vice-Admiral, a well-known solicitor, a generous plutocrat, an eminent architect and one or two other persons of whom we know nothing and who may be quite harmless. At any rate there is nothing outrageous among the New Year's Honours, for which relief much thanks. Among the new Knights are actually men of distinction or ability, as for example Sir Francis Darwin, Sir William Tyrrell, Mr. Liberty, the Premier of Newfoundland, the Premier of Ontario, the General Manager of the London and North-Western Railway, and Sir George Turner, the devoted doctor of the Pretoria Leper Asylum. For once the Radical Plutocracy has taken a back seat. Let us hope, without expecting, that they will remain there.

Adjournment of Land Crusade

The R.P.E. have another feather in their cap as the result of the open and above-board enquiry, in marked contradiction to Mr. Lloyd George's organisation of "area sneaks"—the Secret Land Enquiry—which they are conducting upon the administration of Radical estates with a view to ascertaining whether the Radical Plutocrat practises the doctrines which Mr. Lloyd George preaches and on the acquiescence in which the landowners of the Radical Party have secured a vast proportion of the plums

of public life. In the first instance notice was served in accordance with the frank procedure adopted by the R.P.E. in the case of the "Honours" enquiry upon the leading Coalition landlords, of which conspicuous specimens adorn the Asquith Cabinet—though whether their record as landlords is superior to their record as politicians time will show—that their properties were under observation, and they were forwarded a covering letter together with the questions which have also been distributed among Radical and Unionist Members of Parliament as well as to the Press and other likely enquirers. We make no apology for reproducing these salutary questions, although they have been previously published in the *National Review:*

QUESTIONS CONCERNING RADICAL LANDOWNERS

SIR,—Are there any Radical landowners in your neighbourhood or in neighbourhoods with which you are acquainted? Are any of them Members of the present Government? Have any of them become Peers, Baronets, Privy Councillors, &c., since November 1905?

What is their local attitude towards the land question?

How does the administration of Radical estates within your knowledge compare with the administration of other estates in the same neighbourhood? What steps have such Radical landlords taken as regards land under their control to stop the drift of population into the towns? To what extent have they increased the amenities of village life? Have they been active in building cottages, generous in letting them at a low rent, and careful in keeping them in good repair?

Are their rents, generally speaking, higher or lower or equal to rents on adjoining estates? Where lower, is this owing to large game preservation?

Do Radical landlords whom you know pay a "living wage" to their labourers? What weekly wages do they pay?

Do they put political pressure upon their "dependents" to support the present Government? If so, give instances.

Can you give instances of men being turned out of their farms, holdings, or cottages because their opinions are displeasing to their Radical landlords, or owing to disputes arising from differences over the preservation of game? Do you know of Radical estates on which enquiry is made as to the political opinions of those seeking tenancy or employment?

Are all the schools under Radical control equally available for political meetings on either side during a General Election or at any other time?

To what extent have Radical landlords within your knowledge helped the inhabitants of adjoining towns "back to the land" by means of small holdings? How far have any acted on the policy proclaimed by Sir HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, on becoming Prime Minister in 1905, that the pheasant would be replaced by the peasant?

Do you know of cases in which Radical landowners have replaced the peasant or farmer by the pheasant and the gamekeeper, or in which they have consolidated pro-

parties for the purpose of creating game preserves or deer parks in unsuitable countries? Has any considerable acreage in consequence gone out of cultivation, with consequent diminution of agricultural employment?

If any Radical landlords in your neighbourhood are large game preservers, please make exhaustive enquiries concerning the system on which their shooting-parties are conducted, and to what extent they give away their game at or near elections?

To what extent do their humbler neighbours have access to Radical parks or pleasure-grounds?

Do you know of Radical landlords closing, or seeking to close, old footpaths or other rights of way, or encroaching on commons?

Is there any demand for small holdings in the neighbourhood of Radical estates? Please furnish any instances in which this demand has been met by the splitting up of Radical properties or of Radical parks, or, on the contrary, has been refused.

I beg to remain,

Yours faithfully,

THE HON. SECRETARY RADICAL PLUTOCRACY ENQUIRY.

N.B.—Enquirers should remember that absolute accuracy is of the utmost importance in order that this enquiry may serve its purpose. When they are in doubt as to the correct answers to any of these questions, or to other questions to be subsequently circulated, they should make it a point of honour to give the subjects of the enquiry (*i.e.* Radical landlords) the benefit of the doubt.

The "Sob Artist"

HITHERTO Unionists, especially Unionist landlords, had taken everything lying down, content to rely on the justice of their cause and the really splendid record of the British Squirearchy, which taking it all in all constitutes with the British Navy and the British Army and our administration abroad the finest public service we possess. As a result of this passive attitude all Tory landlords, rich and poor, became the common cockshy of the Coalition Demagogues from the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Lord Advocate of Scotland down to Messrs. Hemmerde and Outhwaite. Radical plutocrats might enjoy every farthing of any "unearned increment" which illegitimately accrued to them from the illicit information imparted to the favoured few by those "in the know" of, say, the gamble in Marconi shares, whereby huge fortunes were made without the slightest risk in a very short time and without any of those "social services" of which we hear so much on Radical platforms but which are far to seek among the Radical plutocracy. The latter not unnaturally applauded and encouraged the new crusade against the particular form of over-burdened property which they happened not to possess, all the

more as it diverted attention from their own colossal liquid wealth. The Secret Land Enquiry was financed by opulent aliens for their own purposes. We have always held that the only way to deal with demagogues and their plutocratic backers is, without descending to Limehouse methods or Limehouse language, to give them homœopathic doses of their own medicine. This in effect has at last been done in some small measure, and we trust the doses will be progressively increased. As we have said, there are great landed proprietors in the Asquith Cabinet and among the Radical Party who have rejoiced and profited by the Lloyd George campaign against Tory landowners. Indeed, it would be no exaggeration to say that Mr. L. V. Harcourt, the Colonial Secretary, and the Most Noble the Marquess of Crewe, Knight of the Garter, to say nothing of other feudal hangers-on of Mr. Asquith, owe the positions for which some of them are ludicrously unfit to their tolerance of the orgies of Limehouse, Mile End, Aberdeen, and other places where Mr. Lloyd George has "told the truth" about the Land Question. They stood by and sanctioned the Secret Land Enquiry, which they dared not resist for fear of being kicked out of the Government by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But the moment the Lloyd George Nobility realised that enquiry would be made into the administration of their properties with a view to ascertaining how far they attain the standards prescribed by the great "sob artist" (to use an expressive Canadianism for emotional orators) for Tory landlords they began to laugh on the wrong side of their mouths, and realised that the time had come to cry Halt.

Radical Properties

The record of Radical landowners is a tolerably bad one. The first idea of the new-fledged plutocratic peer or baronet is to devote some portion of his colossal wealth to the purchase of the historic estate of some Tory Peer who has been taxed out of existence. He not infrequently proceeds to stop the pensions of the poor old people, to evict farmers in order to make room for keepers' lodges, and generally to sacrifice the peasant to the pheasant, which is the reverse of what Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman promised to do when his party came into power seven years ago. Urban Radicals

may talk glibly of the "minimum wage" to be paid to agricultural labourers, but where are the Radical landlords who pay such a wage, or even a "living wage," to their unfortunate "dependents"? We hear a great deal of the shortage of cottages, which is an undoubtedly crying evil in many places largely on account of Radical legislation and hostility to agriculture. But where are the Radical estates with a superabundant supply of cottages, and what have Radical landlords done to help the denizens of congested cities "back to the land" by means of small holdings? Then again look at the manner in which your purse-proud Radical plutocrat encroaches on common land, closes footpaths, denies access to his park to his humbler neighbours, and generally devotes himself to "swank" in the shape of huge battues of unoffending pheasants imported for the day in £1000 motor-cars. Happily Radical "shoots" are occasionally less murderous than they were intended to be, because, although the Radical plutocrat does not act on the principle of "one man one gun," but is armed with as many weapons as he and several loaders can carry, his aim leaves much to be desired; while his guests, though equally bloodthirsty, are equally harmless. The Enquiry might be carried on indefinitely, and it would be found that the standard prevailing on Radical estates bears no resemblance whatsoever to the speeches made by Radical politicians. Moreover, in nine cases out of ten the mushroom Radical squire is an infinitely harsher employer, a more inconsiderate, indifferent and ignorant landlord than his wicked Tory neighbours. Our readers cannot fail to have observed that the mere hint of an open enquiry concerning Radical properties has temporarily knocked out the Secret Land Enquiry, and, as might have been foretold, it is announced that Mr. Lloyd George's new crusade against "the feudal system" which he was to "burst up" has been indefinitely postponed, despite the reiterated assertion that the Secret Land Enquiry has collected abundant information to establish Mr. Lloyd George's case up to the hilt. In its place we are threatened with a campaign on "Education" by the Lord Chancellor, into which the Chancellor of the Exchequer is to throw himself "heart and soul." It doubtless offers some scope to the great "sob artist" who can at any moment play upon the emotions of any audience upon any subject except the luckless

victims of his own Insurance Act, the operation of which was instantly followed by a crop of funerals due to inadequate medical attendance.

Fury of "Wild Men"

NEEDLESS to say the land crusaders in the House of Commons are furious that the energies of the "sob artist" should be diverted, and there is wailing throughout the Cocoa Press, which belongs to multi-millionaires possessing every form of wealth except land. However, for once, though it may not be for long, Radical landowners have asserted themselves; while Radical plutocrats generally are beginning to realise that "unearned increment," apart from land, especially on vast financial operations conducted for their exclusive benefit and a minimum advantage to the community, offer infinitely more openings to the tax-gatherer than landed property which may in some cases have gained through urban development, but which has suffered enormous depreciation while financiers have been making fortunes. We have before taken the illustration of the Marconi shares, which appreciated by 300 per cent. during the opening months of this year, and we would ask any Radical economist to explain on what principle this enormous "unearned increment" should escape the attentions of Somerset House while tea pays 5d. a pound and "cheap" tobacco 500 per cent., though we believe that the choicest cigars, like the choicest champagne of the Radical plutocracy, was let off somewhat cheaply in the great People's Budget of 1909?

Lord Roberts' Birthday Gift

AN impressive episode occurred at Apsley House on January 22, when Lord Roberts was presented by his admirers with a "birthday gift" for which £5000 had been subscribed. The bulk will be devoted by Lord Roberts to the propaganda of the National Service League. With the balance a solid silver statuette, after Mr. Bernard Partridge's fine design symbolical of "Armed Peace," had been bought, and was now presented to Lord Roberts by Lord Curzon on behalf of the subscribers at the historic Waterloo Gallery at Apsley House under the chairmanship of the Duke of Wellington. Lord Curzon, who is an accomplished orator, made

a moving speech describing Bord Roberts' self-appointed task and optimistically predicting that we were on the eve of a great awakening. Lord Roberts replied in his usual simple, soldierly, straightforward fashion, which goes to the heart of every audience, dismissing compliments to himself and describing the genesis of the League, which originated with Mr. George Shee's book *The Briton's First Duty*, which attracted the attention of Lord Newton, who was so impressed by it that he founded the National Service League. Sir Clinton Dawkins was a very early pioneer of the movement, which owed much to his keen and vigorous intelligence and undaunted public spirit. That same year (1902) Mr. Shee delivered a lecture at the Royal United Service Institution on "The Advantages of Compulsory Service for Home Defence," among the strong supporters of Mr. Shee being the present Secretary of State for War, who spoke with his personal experience of the South African War fresh in his mind. Colonel Seely declared that, "speaking as a Member of Parliament with a seat to lose," he would say openly that he considered "it would be extremely desirable that it should be obligatory for every male in this country to be trained to arms," adding:

> I am strongly in favour of this matter being put before the public quite frankly. Our countrymen should be told that the danger is imminent; that it can be easily overcome by our own personal exertions, and that in no other way can it be overcome. Not by spending money on ships, although the Navy must always have our first care; not, most assuredly, by shouting about Imperial greatness; but by personal self-sacrifice alone can this Empire be maintained. I go further. I believe that if all these warnings fall upon deaf ears at no distant date this Empire, of which we are so proud, will fall to pieces, and that this nation will be humbled to the dust.

As Lord Roberts said, "These were grand words, but 'the danger' was far more 'imminent' now than it was eleven years ago." When the question of National Defence came to be seriously considered by the Government the principle of the National Service League "could not fail to have a strong supporter in our present Minister for War." Lord Roberts "refused to believe that the man who was prepared in 1902 to give expression to convictions, founded upon personal war experience, on such a vitally important subject as National Defence, at the risk of losing his seat in Parliament, would hesitate in 1913 to give expression to those same convictions at the risk of losing his seat in the Cabinet."

THE UNIONIST PARTY AND PREFERENCE*

In acceding to the request of the Editor that this speech should be reprinted, I have thought it best to allow it to stand exactly as it was spoken. But as the concluding passages have given rise to some misconception, I take this opportunity of expressly disclaiming any idea of attacking the motives or impugning the patriotism of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues. Their services to Imperial Unity and in particular to the cause of Imperial Preference are conspicuous, and would render any such accusation as absurd as it would be ungrateful. And though it seems to me that the effect of the Reciprocity Agreement would have been rather that foretold by President Taft than that desired by the Canadian Ministers, I should be the last man to suggest a doubt of their loyalty to their country and to the Empire. The "Liberals" referred to in the speech are of course the Liberal Party of this country and not of Canada.

January 21. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN

IN a few weeks I shall have completed twenty-one years' service as member for this great constituency. I am proud of that long connection, and in coming before you so near to that anniversary my first thoughts are of gratitude to you for the generous appreciation that you have shown of my services, for the indulgence that you have extended to me when the growing claims of my public life kept me more and more away from you, and for the unwavering support which you have given to me through every trial and difficulty of my public life. A political party, if it is worthy of the name, is an association of men brought together for public action by a common faith in great principles of policy, for the defence and advancement of which the party exists, and without which it would lose all the dignity and usefulness that distinguish a party from a faction. But with such a party there must always be room for honest differences of opinion, sometimes on questions of considerable importance, more often upon questions of detail

* A speech delivered at Acocks Green in Worcestershire on January 13.

and very often indeed as to the exact extent to which at any given moment those principles ought to be pressed to their full and logical completion, and as to the exact extent to which in given circumstances we may yield or must stand out for the full completion of our ideals. I cannot hope that in the long years of my service all of you on all occasions have approved of each individual vote I have given, or have agreed with every speech I have made, but our agreement has been far wider and far deeper than any differences that may have existed among us, and you have always accorded to me the independence of judgment in minor matters without which the position of a member of Parliament would be robbed of all its charm, and instead of being a representative he would become a mere walking delegate and voting machine. I am grateful to you for the indulgence you have extended to me in the past. I count with equal gratitude on a continuance of that indulgence in the present and in the future, and I have need of it now, for the circumstances in which I speak are grave, and the moment is one of those at which silence is easier than speech.

The Unionist Party has been passing through a crisis the extent of which it would be very foolish to exaggerate, but the importance and the gravity of which it would be equally foolish to ignore, and I confess that at such a moment I should, for many reasons, have preferred to maintain silence. But this meeting was fixed long before these conditions were foreseen. I could not have postponed it without giving rise to rumours which I think would have been mischievous and, after all, you and I have been accustomed to discuss matters of public policy with perfect frankness, and I take it that you have a right to expect since the occasion offers that now, as at all times, I should tell you frankly what my mind is and submit my public conduct to your judgment, approbation, or condemnation. As I have said, if I had consulted only my own feelings I should have preferred to remain silent at this moment. I should have been glad to leave the next word on the present situation with our leaders, Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Bonar Law. It is with them that the decisive word rests. They speak with a peculiar responsibility and authority which attach to none but themselves, or at least to no others in the same degree. The course of events has placed them in a position

of difficulty which I think all of us must recognise, and I hope that no word that I may speak to-night may do anything to add to the difficulties of their position, for whatever the differences which have existed in the Unionist Party may be, there is one thing on which we are all united, in which every member of the party in the House of Commons or in the House of Lords is agreed, and which I think every member of the party in the country equally shares, and that is admiration for the character and the abilities of our leaders, sympathy with them in the difficult position in which they are placed, and the earnest desire that we should retain their services as leaders in the great struggle in which we are engaged. That is, indeed, the dominant factor in the present situation. It is the earnest wish of every member of the Unionist Party, and, in my case, the wish is heightened by ties of personal friendship which bind me to both those gentlemen and by the uniform kindness and generous consideration which now, as always, they have extended to me.

As I have said, the Unionist Party has been passing, and is perhaps still passing, through a crisis. For some weeks past the condition of the party has occupied a large space, far too large a space, in the Unionist Press and in the speeches and conversations of members of the party itself. When a man sits with his fingers on his pulse and insists upon continually taking his own temperature with a clinical thermometer, he is apt to fret himself quite unnecessarily into a state of high fever, and something of that kind has happened to the Unionist Party in these last few weeks. When the troubles have passed, when the temperature of the patient is again normal, I hope we shall have learnt our lesson. A little less thought about our own difficulties and a good deal more attention devoted to the difficulties and the misdeeds of our opponents will make for a healthier opposition and will bring about a speedier victory for the cause in whose success we are interested.

In the meantime it would be impossible to ignore those difficulties, we each and all of us have to face them and to make up our minds frankly about them. I invite you to consider what has happened. In the middle of the month of November there was assembled in London the largest Conference, as I am informed, that ever met together as delegates of the

Unionist Party from all parts of the country. I am told that it was the largest. It was certainly the most representative. For the first time in our history Liberal Unionists and Conservatives sat together in one conference to consider in common the policy of our common party. At that Conference there was moved by one of our veterans, Mr. Henry Chaplin, a resolution which he had moved at conferences of the National Union of Conservative Associations since, I think, 1893 in favour of the full policy of Tariff Reform and Imperial Preference, with which for all those years our party has been associated. The resolution was carried with unanimity and enthusiasm by the whole of that great body of delegates. The meetings of the Conference were brought to a conclusion by a great demonstration in the Albert Hall, where speeches were made by both our leaders, Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Bonar Law, and those who, like myself, were present at the gathering will not easily forget the enthusiasm which their entrance evoked, the special warmth of the welcome accorded to Mr. Bonar Law in recognition of the courage and ability with which he had led our party for the past year in the House of Commons, and the warm approval that was given to the declarations of the two leaders by the whole of the great assembly.

A few weeks later the policy there laid down was further explained and elaborated by Mr. Bonar Law in a speech which he made at Ashton-under-Lyne. Between the two meetings there had been an election in Bolton, an election which we did not win, though we improved the position of the Unionist Party, and of which I will only say that having conversed with some of the leaders of Lancashire opinion both before and since, I have not met one competent judge who, before the election, thought that we had a chance of winning the seat or, after the election, pretended for one moment that the policy of Tariff Reform and Imperial Preference was the cause or the occasion of our defeat. The speeches at the Albert Hall, and still more the Bolton election, were followed by some criticism and some restlessness in certain quarters, of which I will only say that they are not those which in the past have been most remarkable for the stable support of any policy whatever, nor are they those in which or by which the greatest successes of the Unionist Party

have been won. The speech at Ashton was undoubtedly intended to allay that restlessness. I am afraid it did not have that effect. It was thought in some quarters to indicate a weakening of our position. It was thought in others to place an undue responsibility for the fiscal policy of the United Kingdom upon the shoulders of the statesmen of the Dominions. I did not so interpret it. I am quite certain that that was not the intention of Mr. Bonar Law, and though—as I think I may now state without indiscretion and as indeed is evident from the speeches which I myself was making only three days before in Glasgow and on the night of the Ashton speech at Carlisle—I had not been consulted about that declaration and did not wholly agree with it, I was prepared then, as on previous occasions, to subordinate my own preference to the views of my leader and to continue the fight upon the ground which he had chosen. I should be ready to do so still if the position remained unchanged. Unfortunately it is not unchanged. The doubts, honestly felt in some quarters, maliciously suggested in others, rapidly produced a mischievous effect. Timid men became frightened, strong upholders of the policy were puzzled, uncertainty spread, and in a short time there developed a widespread movement in different parts of the country for the abandonment, or at least for the postponement, of that part of Unionist policy of Preference which, whilst remitting a portion of the duties which now press upon objects of common consumption by the poor, at the same time involved the imposition of some new duties upon staple articles of food.

The movement was taken up by a portion of the Unionist Press. It spread rapidly in the hesitation and uncertainty which prevailed, and before long it embraced a large portion of the Unionist Party in Parliament. It was urged that this redistribution of duties and the imposition of these new duties were unpopular. I have never doubted it. I have never doubted that they lent themselves to easy misrepresentation, and knowing and watching the Liberal Party as I have known and watched it, I have never supposed that any scruple as regards Imperial interests or any regard for honour or truth would prevent them from taking full advantage of that temporary unpopularity and turning it to the best advantage they could for their own

party purposes. I have never doubted it, but for great ends and in a great cause, with deep conviction and a profound faith, I was willing to face that unpopularity—to fight it and to meet it until we had conquered it. It was urged besides that those new duties were not needed for any purpose in the United Kingdom itself, that they were not essential to the establishment of the principle of Preference within the British Empire; that they had caused the defeat of the Unionist Party at three elections and would cause our defeat at yet a fourth.

I did not share those views. I do not share them now. I believe that those duties are needed if we are to do justice to our own agriculture, and above all, if we are to make reasonably certain the success of those small owners and occupiers the creation of which it is part of our policy to encourage and to promote. I believed, and I believe, that though you may have Preference without any new taxation, you cannot have any complete or permanent community of commercial interest between the different parts of the Empire unless you are prepared to vote these new taxes. I altogether deny that those views are not capable of clear explanation and of full justification at any gathering of our countrymen, or that they have been proved by anything which has taken place to be incapable of acceptance by them. It is not true to say that we have been beaten because we fought upon this issue. It would be much truer to say that we have been beaten because we did not fight upon this issue and because we left the field in too many cases open to the misrepresentation of our opponents. It is not true to say that we fought upon this issue at the General Election of 1906, or that we were beaten at that time because of it. Any one who remembers the circumstances and recalls them for a moment to his mind knows that the position of the Unionist Party was shaken to its foundations before the Tariff Reform controversy arose at all, shaken over the provisions of the Education Act, for instance, and everybody knows that before the Tariff Reform question was raised the Unionist Government of the day was losing by-election after by-election, and everybody who thinks a little more about the circumstances and who enquires a little closer into them will see that the first result of the raising of this great Imperial question was a renewal of enthusiasm and

strength in the party and a greater success at the by-elections which followed. If that movement had been followed with courage and with unanimity, though I do not think that at that time it could have saved the Unionist Party from defeat, it would at least have prevented that defeat from being turned into a disaster. It is not true that we fought on this question in 1906. It was postponed to another occasion by Mr. Balfour's pledge that there should be a second election before anything else was done. It is not true that we fought upon this question in December 1910. It was relegated at that time to some special appeal or referendum thereafter to be taken among the people. The only occasion of which it would be true to say that this question was an immediate and an imminent factor in a General Election was in January 1910, when the Unionist Party won more than 100 seats. Where has the Unionist Party been most constantly successful? Where was the fort held when so many strongholds went down? Here in our city of Birmingham, where from the first with unanimity, with courage, and with persistency the whole Tariff question was faced and every candidate among us did his best to make it the issue of the election.

The inference which I drew from these facts was not that we ought to abandon or even to postpone any part of that policy, but that we should fight it with courage, with consistency, with energy, and with conviction. Since the question was thus raised again, and the old doubts showed themselves afresh, I pressed upon my colleagues and friends that we should throw our whole strength into the campaign, and should not cease from the struggle until we had once for all destroyed the misrepresentations with which our policy had been clouded and till we had brought home to the masses of our countrymen the advantages which our policy carried for each and all of them, brought home to them the magnitude of the Imperial interests which were involved, and the greatness of the opportunity that was within their grasp. I believed then, and I still believe, that that policy would not only have been the most natural, the most courageous, and the most right. I believe it would have been also the wisest. I pressed it with all the force of the conviction that I entertained. I pressed it with all the power at my command,

and I did not cease from urging it until it was made clear to me that not only could I not carry the same conviction to the minds of my leaders and friends, not only could I not secure the particular object which I had in view, but that further persistence might endanger the success of all the causes for which the Unionist Party is trustee.

I have to recognise that the decision, for the time at any rate, is against me. I have to acknowledge that the great majority of the party took and take a different view. But for the first time in my long connection with it, for the first time in the eleven years that I have been permitted to sit in the councils of that party, I am unable to take any share of responsibility for the decision to which they have come. I cannot turn my back upon myself. I cannot unsay what I have said. I cannot pretend to like the change in our attitude. I cannot pretend to view without misgivings its possible effect.

I am afraid that this change may be a calamity for the party with which all my public life has been associated. I am afraid it may prove a misfortune for the Empire which it has been my earnest desire to serve. But I have been too long engaged in politics to suppose that I can always have my own way, too long to sulk because I cannot now persuade the party to take a course in this one matter which I believe to be alike the right course and the wise course; and though I have to admit my disappointment and acknowledge my fears, I will do my best in the future as I have done my best in the past to support my leaders and to co-operate with my political friends. I care too much for the other great causes whose success is bound up with that of the Unionist Party to sit idly by and not to render what help I can in their defence or their promotion.

And do not suppose that if our attitude is somewhat changed, if the full development of the policy which we have supported is postponed, is possibly even endangered, that therefore nothing has been accomplished, or that things are, or ever will be, as if the Tariff Reform movement had never been. That movement has changed the attitude of public opinion to all Imperial problems. It has drawn a new attention to them; it has excited a new interest in them. It has killed once and for all the old Cobdenite idea that the best thing we had to do with

the Empire was to get rid of it, that the easiest way to settle our Imperial problem was to cut the knot which tied us to our kinsmen across the seas. And it has removed in the eyes of our kinsmen overseas the reproach which, twenty years ago, was all too common on their lips against the Old Country, and not wholly undeserved by us, the reproach that we were careless of their progress, uninterested in their development, and thoughtless of the position which they might take as kindred and sister nations with us in maintaining the power and authority of the British name. The movement has confirmed the Imperial spirit, it has helped to defeat American reciprocity with Canada, it has helped to produce those contributions from the Colonies towards Imperial defence which culminated only the other day in the magnificent offer which Mr. Borden has proposed on behalf of the Canadian people. It has secured the maintenance during all these years of a preference for British products in Canadian markets, and I hope it may secure it still. It has caused a spread of that movement from Dominion to Dominion until there is not a self-governing nation of the British race which does not accord to the produce of our industry, our factories, and our looms a preference in their markets over those of our foreign competitors. It has encouraged them to try and spread a network of such preferences throughout the Empire. It has encouraged Canada to make an agreement with the West Indies. It has been the salvation of those, our oldest, Colonial possessions. It has encouraged Canada to pursue the negotiations in which she is now engaged for a similar reciprocal agreement with Australia.

It has already brought in these ways vast benefits to our people; how great they are you may see if you look for a moment at the figures of our trade with Canada. That trade in British produce and manufactures, which in the six years before Preference had fallen from seven millions a year to five, had risen last year to nearly twenty millions, a gain of fifteen millions. Reckoned, as I suppose it may be reckoned, and as it commonly is, that half that sum would been have spent in wages, seven and a half millions was paid in wages to British workmen which otherwise might have gone to our foreign competitors.

It has been possible for the great Dominions, with their wide

tariffs and their protective system, to give us this preference without imposing additional duties of any kind. It is not possible for us to do the same with our restricted duties, but it is possible for us to do something even on our present list of duties if for the present we may not look beyond. And as a result of the events of the last few weeks one fact stands out, I think, clearly: that, if we cannot now do all that I had hoped, at any rate, the party is more wholeheartedly, more irrevocably, more enthusiastically united in the determination that what we can do in this direction shall be done. Wherever there is a duty which can be made the subject of preference, preference shall be given, and to give it will be one of the first acts of any Unionist Administration. That is the fact which marks the gulf that divides Liberals from Unionists in this matter. To the Liberal the idea of treating your kinsman better than strangers, of doing more for your friends than you do for your rivals, is anathema. To us it is the kernel and the essence of the whole question. To Liberals a reciprocal arrangement with our kinsmen across the seas is but a sordid bond. To us it is a pledge of brotherhood and a tie of unity. By the Liberals the conclusion between the late Government of Canada and the United States of America of a similar reciprocal arrangement, from which the Mother Country was excluded,* was hailed as doubly blessed. By us it was felt to be a calamity, from which the patriotism and the Imperialism of the people of Canada have happily delivered us. Yet the Liberal who will not consent to consider for a moment the proposal for Preference, even in tobacco and wine and tea, with our own kinsmen, hailed with rejoicing the conclusion of an agreement between the Governments of Canada and the United States, which was intended by the American negotiators to divert the food-supplies which Canada sends here to the market of the United States and which would have had the effect, in President Taft's own words, of making Canada—the oldest, the greatest, and the most prosperous of our Dominions—"an adjunct" of its Southern neighbour. Ladies and gentlemen, when I think

* Excluded, that is, on the American side. It was intended by the Canadian Ministers to extend to the Empire whatever concessions were granted by Canada to the U.S.A.

of the great issues involved, when I think of the great steps taken by our kinsmen across the seas, when I think of what they have done and are doing for us, when I think of their support of our trade, their support of the Imperial Navy, then I say that I, at any rate, am reluctant, at such a moment above all, to relax my own efforts to secure a reciprocal feeling on this side of the ocean towards them. It may be that in present circumstances the full fruition of our hopes must be delayed. It may be that the greater issue must be postponed. But the spirit of the Empire is with us, the force of events is fighting on our side. The movement has made progress, and it will make progress, and, for my part, I abandon no part of the convictions that I have expressed to you; I retract nothing of what I have said, and wherever and whenever I see an opportunity I will do my utmost to promote that common organisation of Imperial trade which was first preached by a great Dutchman of South Africa, which was first put in practice by a great Canadian of French descent, which was first made an issue of our own politics by the greatest statesman of our day, and which, even within the last few weeks, was coupled by Mr. Borden in the great speech which he made on the naval defence of the Empire with the common organisation of Imperial defence as the twin pillars which for the future must carry the arch of Empire.

AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN

OUR COMING DANGER-PERIOD

AND THE MEASURES TO MEET IT

THOUGH the people of this country will doubtless congratulate themselves if by some happy chance the Balkan crisis is settled without a general war, there could be no greater blunder than to ascribe this result to any ascendency of pacifist sentiment in Europe. Germany, usually the great disturber of European peace, has, it is true, assumed a pacific attitude during the quarrel between Austria on the one hand and Russia and Servia on the other. That might give cause for satisfaction were there not every reason to believe that her attitude has been due to the fact that her naval preparations are not yet far enough advanced to give her fleet a clear chance of success at sea. The dominant force in German policy more than at any time in the past is the wish to "settle" with England, whom the German people have been taught by their Government to regard as the Power that selfishly refuses Germany her "place in the sun." The dominant personality in German politics is Admiral Tirpitz, because he stands for the realisation of that wish. Germans have ever affected to regard France, in the courteous words of the *Kölnische Zeitung*, as "either vassal or prey." If she has incurred their special hostility, it is only because she dares to live on good terms with England. From Admiral Tirpitz's standpoint a war upon two fronts on land, at a time when the German navy is unable to act with effect, would simply strengthen the British position and sacrifice vital German interests for Austrian ambitions. By waiting till the Germany navy is ready to intervene with effect, everything that Germany wants may be attained at one blow. Moreover, the hope has always been cherished by German diplomatists that Russia may be detached from the Triple Entente, in

which case everything need not be risked by fighting her now. A war with Russia is above all others feared by the German military party.

From October to February 15 is the danger-period for Europe in each year, as the fresh contingent of recruits in France joins at the end of September, and the time-expired men are discharged. Thus, with the two years' service system in force in France, the French strength with the colours falls in October to little more than 350,000 trained men. Not until February 15 are the new recruits fit to take the field. In Germany, where men in the specialist arms serve for three years, the strength is far better maintained. And the Emperor has the right to keep time-expired men with the colours in any emergency by a simple order. If this right is exercised, Germany is at her very strongest early in October, while France is at her weakest. So grave was the peril to France from this cause that in the Agadir crisis the French military authorities were compelled to resort to special measures, such as calling up reservists, to maintain the strength of the corps on the frontier. A further important fact is that the German fleet is readiest for war in October, before which date a new batch of ships joins it each year. It should not be forgotten that this danger-period recurs every year and will recur unless the French system is modified.

There are indications that next October Admiral Tirpitz may regard the conditions as favourable to his aims. An indefinite postponement of the "settlement" with England must be attended by many risks. In the first place, there is the possibility that the next few years may witness the creation of an Imperial fleet to supplement the British Navy. Should Canada decide to give three battleships to the King, a squadron of four battleships (including the ship given by the Malay States), over and above those laid down under the British programmes, would be in existence by the end of 1916. Such a squadron would modify the naval position. In the second place, there is a bare chance that the British Government might wake up and arm in real earnest, recognising the tremendous danger that threatens the Empire. In the third place, the French naval programme is now at last beginning to make good progress, and three years hence the French Navy will once more have to be taken into serious

account. In the fourth place, the new Russian naval programme cannot be entirely neglected, and unless Russia can be won over, Germany will have to detach some force to watch the Russian fleet and will not be able to concentrate her entire strength against England in the North Sea four years hence. In the fifth place, in October next the German navy will have a possible chance of success, failing special precautions on the part of the British Admiralty.

The two most important factors in the material of modern naval war are large modern battleships, or "Dreadnoughts," and destroyers. Submarines may play a great part in the remote future, but for vigorous offensive work on the high sea they have not as yet sufficient speed or adequate nautical qualities, though in both directions they are improving very rapidly. It is important to note how we stand to-day in these two classes of vessels and how we shall stand in the near future. The British force of "Dreadnoughts" complete is 21 built for the British Navy plus the *New Zealand* provided by the Dominion. Of these 20 British ships and the *New Zealand* are in home waters, and one in the Mediterranean. The German force complete is 13, of which one is in the Mediterranean. One Italian and one Austrian "Dreadnought" are complete in the Mediterranean, giving the Triple Alliance a total of 15 ships of this type to the 22 British. No other European Power possesses any completed "Dreadnoughts." Of large modern destroyers Britain has approximately 108 ready, and Germany 96.

By next October, however, the conditions will be singularly modified, unless the British Admiralty completely changes its present plans. The British force of completed "Dreadnoughts" will then rise to 25 plus the New Zealand ship and the Australian ship. The *New Zealand* is to be sent off on a visit to New Zealand, and as she is not to return to England before October 15, she cannot be reckoned as available in Europe early in that month. The Australian ship in any case is to be stationed in the Pacific. This leaves us with 25 "Dreadnoughts" in Europe. Four of these are to be permanently stationed in the Mediterranean and based upon Malta; a fifth is to act as flagship of the fourth battle squadron, which is based upon Gibraltar, four and a half days from the North Sea; leaving 20 "Dreadnoughts" for the North Sea.

As our ships can only be kept in effective order if they are regularly docked and refitted, the practice has obtained of detaching ships one by one from the various squadrons every year for their refits, which usually occupy about a month. At any given moment from two to three "Dreadnoughts" out of 20 will be absent from the fleet for this reason. If we allow two ships absent, we have an effective strength with the flag of 18; if three, of 17. Only during the manœuvres are the squadrons at or near their full strength. On January 1, for example, of our 21 "Dreadnoughts" at home, the *Neptune*, *Vanguard*, and *Orion* were in the dockyard hands, leaving 18 effective.

The German force in "Dreadnoughts" will rise to 17 in October next. One of these—the *Goeben*—in all probability will be stationed in the Mediterranean, leaving 16 in the North Sea. As the German navy is not compelled to be perpetually "on watch," and as the enormous strength of the German land forces precludes any chance of a successful invasion of German territory by the tiny handful of troops that Britain has available, the German ships can be docked, a large number at a time, without the slightest risk being run. Thus when the German fleet goes to sea it can go to sea with all its force. Moreover, because Germany will attack, she can choose her time to strike her blow and have everything ready for it. As Mr. Churchill said in the House of Commons last year: "We have to be able to meet at our average moment the naval force of an attacking Power at their selected moment." It would have been even more correct had he said: "We have to be able to meet at our most unfavourable moment the naval force of Germany at her selected moment." For General Bernhardi has suggested that the German navy should attack us on any opportunity without even a declaration of war; and Admiral Stiege, of the German navy, writing in a publication which was issued with Admiral Tirpitz's sanction and support, has urged that the commander-in-chief of the German fleet should be given the right to deliver the blow when he sees a favourable chance, on the express ground that, if he waits to communicate with Berlin, the chance may pass. So that these conditions may be assumed: the German fleet concentrated at its maximum strength and perfectly prepared: the British fleet at its moment of greatest weakness and division.

With 13 "Dreadnoughts" against 21, Germany's prospects of success are small. With 16 against 20, of which 3 will probably be absent, there is a chance that a resolute torpedo or mine attack might entirely destroy the British margin of safety. A naval battle in such circumstances might be contemplated without any qualms by the German authorities. They believe that the gunnery of their ships is better than ours, and it is certain that they expend more ammunition in practice. They consider that their guns are vastly superior to ours, though this view is not held by British officers. They regard their armour as superior to ours, and ship for ship there would be little to choose between the units in the fleets, for if our guns fire a heavier projectile (broadside of 17 British "Dreadnoughts," 171,000 lb.; of 16 German, 146,000 lb.) on the average, the German ships are quite as large and carry an excellent 6-in. battery, which our ships lack, and enormously powerful torpedo equipments. Above all, German seamen place their faith in an admirable staff system and unity of doctrine. The British War Staff is too recent a creation to have permeated the Navy with its thought. And unity of doctrine is notoriously absent from our command. The unsatisfactory Cabinet Inquiry into the British war plans, held in 1909, reported that "the Committee have been impressed with the differences of opinion among officers of high rank and professional attainments regarding important principles of naval strategy and tactics." This evil cannot have been removed in the brief period that has elapsed since 1909, as it takes years to secure unity of doctrine. On the most important question of all, whether the British fleet should adopt the vigorous offensive, incredible as it may seem, there is no general agreement. One of the lecturers at the Naval War College teaches the importance of the defensive, and even seems to doubt whether the true mission of a Navy is "to devote itself whole-heartedly to the destruction of the enemy's fleet." Thus a principle, accepted as fundamental in the German and indeed in every other navy but our own, and taught as fundamental in every military war school in the world, is apparently doubted by the British Navy or its teachers. The position would almost seem to be that which existed in the upper ranks of the French Army in 1870 when many French generals believed that their business was not to beat the enemy, but to take up a

"magnificent position," in which to repel the enemy's attacks. It is a fact of exceeding gravity that this view seems to have dominated the operations of the forces representing the British fleet in the manœuvres of last year. Admiral Sir George Callaghan, with a much weaker fleet, representing the German navy, was able to achieve a distinct success, acting against an opponent thus hampered, and to effect an imaginary landing upon our shores. This, too, though he was opposed by a fleet of twice his strength, whereas next October, as we have seen, the British Admiral may quite conceivably find himself with only 17 or 18 ships to 16.

There will be no doubts, no hesitations, in the German fleet. An admirable French summary of German naval opinion states its conclusions thus: "The moral advantages of the offensive are so great that, as a general principle, offensive action must be adopted, provided that the proportion of forces on both sides or other circumstances do not render success impossible." General Bernhardi, it is true, doubts or affects to doubt the possibility of an offensive against England, except by some sudden surprise. But this sudden surprise is precisely what the new German Navy Act passed last year is intended to render possible, by giving Germany a very large mass of ships always available for sudden action, and, in fact, keeping on the war footing four-fifths of her fleet.

Under this Navy Act Germany will have from next October, fully manned and available for instant action in the North Sea, whenever her Government thinks the conditions favourable: 13 "Dreadnought" battleships; 3 "Dreadnought" cruisers; 10 battleships "Deutschland" class; 6 battleships of old type ("Mecklenburg" class plus 1 "Kaiser"); 5 older armoured cruisers; a total of 37 armoured ships. Under Mr. Churchill's vaunted organisation, with the fourth battle squadron at Gibraltar, the British fully manned force in home waters will be approximately as follows: 17 "Dreadnought" battleships (deduct 2 in dock, leaving 15); 3 "Dreadnought" cruisers (deduct 1 in dock, leaving 2); 8 "King Edwards" (deduct 1 in dock, leaving 7 effective); 10 older armoured cruisers (deduct 1 in dock, leaving 9 effective); a total of only 38 armoured ships nominally present with the flag, reduced by deductions to 33 instantly available at

our "average moment." Behind these there will be some fourteen old battleships and ten or a dozen old armoured cruisers, manned with half crews, which cannot be regarded as instantly available since their officers and men will need some days to "shake down."

In the Mediterranean the British force at this date will be composed as follows: 4 "Dreadnought" cruisers; 1 "Dreadnought" battleship; 2 "Lord Nelsons"; 5 old battleships ("Duncan" class); 4 old armoured cruisers. The forces of the Triple Alliance will stand as follows:

	Germany	Austria	Italy
Dreadnoughts	1	2	4
Lord Nelsons	0	3	0
Older battleships	0	6	8
Old type armoured cruisers	0	3	9

Giving the Triple Alliance 7 "Dreadnoughts," each of individual force greatly superior to our ships, against 5 British "Dreadnoughts," and 17 older battleships to our 7. So overwhelming is the superiority of the Triple Alliance that, if Austria and Italy support Germany, the British force must run, abandoning Malta and the line of communications to India and Egypt. If the alliance of France were secured and the French fleet were free to devote its entire attention to offensive operations, this would add to the British strength 2 "Dreadnoughts," 6 "Lord Nelsons," 10 older battleships, and 6 old armoured cruisers, and would give the Anglo-French force a slight advantage. But if France is to take part in the war she must be prepared to meet Germany and Italy on her eastern frontier. For that purpose she will want every available man, and will need to transport from Algiers and Morocco to Marseilles the large force which she at present maintains in North Africa. In 1911 the British Admiralty declared itself unable to cover the transport of a British expeditionary force across the Channel until the German navy had been defeated. Is it not even more probable, in view of the tremendous issues which hang upon the prompt arrival of the African army corps, that the French Admiralty might declare itself unable to move against the fleets of the Triple Alliance, until it had covered the transfer of the African troops to France? Nor can any one doubt that such a declaration would be made in perfect faith and with every justification and reason behind it.

For this reason we cannot count the French fleet as available in the South of Europe. The situation in the Mediterranean will be every whit as grave as that in the North Sea. Even if Italy remained neutral, our difficulties would be great and our force none too large. But the danger is that Germany may select some *casus belli*, such as, for example, the right of the Triple Alliance to dispose of certain islands in the Ægean and to plant coaling-stations there, which would secure the support of the Italian Government. There are many people who believe that this right will be asserted before many months have passed and that the stationing of the German "Dreadnought" *Goeben* in the Mediterranean is the prelude to such a move. It is alleged that, when the Triple Alliance was renewed last year, the old understandings between Britain and France on the one hand and Italy on the other lapsed. And it is noteworthy that Italy has supported Austria in the Albanian question, to the detriment of the King of Italy's own father-in-law, and, as it would seem to a distant onlooker and a sincere well-wisher, to the injury of deeper Italian interests. The weaker the British fleet in the Mediterranean, the greater will be Italy's difficulty in resisting German pressure. So that the decline of our naval power has strengthened Germany's hold over the Triple Alliance and raised up for ourselves new dangers beside the German.

To return to the North Sea, by next October the German flotilla of modern large destroyers will in all probability be at least equal in numbers to our own. It is believed that the twelve destroyers which, under the German programme, should not have been voted before April next or laid down before May were actually taken in hand in December. As Germany can complete destroyers in less than nine months—one boat indeed was completed in a few days over six months—if these craft are vigorously pushed forward, they can all be at sea next October. In that case Germany will have 120 good destroyers, or, if two are deducted for foreign service, 118. The British strength will stand at 128, but of these at least 10, and perhaps 15, will be stationed in the Mediterranean, leaving us with 113 or 118 in the North Sea. The public may well ask what has become of the margin, "larger than 60 per cent." over the German force, which Mr. Churchill postulated in March 1912 as necessary for our safety. Had a margin

of 60 per cent. over the effective German force been maintained, we should have 192 destroyers next October. Had the margin been 70 per cent., we should have 204. The minimum standard is not attained; it is not even approached. Nor does our superiority in submarines compensate for our weakness in the far more valuable class of destroyers. Of submarines effective for high-sea work, we shall have in October, supposing further reinforcements are not sent to the Mediterranean, 19 of the D and E classes and 34 of the C class. The German force will be at least 30 in corresponding craft, for Germany is now energetically building these vessels. At the best, then, in high-sea torpedo craft we shall have from 166 to 171 boats to the German 148 boats. Our preponderance is so small (12 to 16 per cent.) as to render a blockade or close watch of the German coast altogether impossible.

In training there will be nothing to choose between the two torpedo flotillas. The German navy is almost equal to us in fully manned boats; the figures are 73 for the British Navy and 68 for the German, and the German strength is to be gradually raised to 99. As destroyers are peculiarly delicate craft and need constant attention, the British "average" force must always be subject to heavy deductions, while the German destroyers at a "selected moment," for reasons given already, can be ready to the last boat. It is probably well within the mark to state that at our "average" moment, outside the period of our naval manœuvres, 25 per cent. of our boats would be found ineffective or absent from the squadrons. The harder the flotillas are worked, the larger the number of boats maintained in full commission, the larger must be this proportion. Apply this formula, and we have 55 destroyers available instantly to the German 68 at the "selected moment."

The rapid development of the German air service is another element of extreme advantage to the German navy. While the British Government will only dole out halfpennies for air-craft, the German Government is spending money with both hands. The British Admiralty with almost unspeakable meanness (at the dictate of our patriotic and underpaid Chancellor of the Exchequer) refuses to pay the naval airmen who risk their lives the flying allowance—except on the days when they actually go up.

The contrast between this treatment of men on whom the nation's very existence depends and that of the members of the House of Commons, who inflict nothing but mischief on the nation, is so extraordinary as to inspire the bitterest thoughts. Four hundred pounds a year is paid to Mr. Lloyd George's friends whether they attend the Commons or malinger. They run no risk. But the naval airman gets no air pay except when he is actually at work. Our naval airmen are second to none. In courage, in skill, they are unrivalled. But they are so few in number, through the crime of the Treasury, and so ill equipped with appliances that they do not weigh in the balance. We have abandoned to Germany the command of the air as against ourselves in any future war. And it may well be that by this act of folly, meanness, and political cowardice we shall seal the fate of our fleet and of the Empire.

The British Navy possesses not one single dirigible capable of extended voyages. Its only effective airship is the tiny Willows craft, which does not seriously count. Three airships of larger size have been ordered. The order for one, incredible as it may sound, has been placed with a German firm, the Parseval Company. If incomplete, in any crisis, the airship would be seized by the German Government—and quite rightly. It therefore is equivalent to an increase in the German available strength at the "selected moment," for which the airship could easily be delayed by the constructing company. For the British Admiralty to have given such an order is more than a blunder; it is a crime. As Colonel Picard has said in one of his works on the Franco-German War, negligence of precaution and carelessness may be carried to a point which is treason. A second airship is ordered from a French company, and to this no such objection can be offered. A third craft is constructing in England. But instead of one airship, ten ought to have been taken in hand and entrusted to British firms. The German aerial fleet numbers over 20 airships built and building. Most of these craft are of large size and high speed. At least three of them, built for naval work and of the largest size, will be complete next October. These vessels will be able to undertake long voyages and to carry two tons of explosives. Their value lies in this, that with them, when "the day" approaches, the German commander-in-chief will be able to ascertain the exact position and strength of the British naval

forces and accordingly to plan his blow. They can carry out the preliminary reconnaissance and prevent such a mistake as the Japanese committed when, on the outbreak of the war in the Far East, they sent half their destroyers to Dalny, where there was not one single Russian warship. It is even possible that serious offensive work might be accomplished by the German dirigibles if the weather was at all favourable. Without similar air craft the British Navy is cruelly handicapped, the more so because of its weakness in fast small cruisers to act as scouts.

The passivity of the British Admiralty through all this period of strain and danger is not one of the least remarkable features of the situation. In its attitude it closely resembles Marshal Bazaine, whose one idea was to talk as much as possible to cover inaction. The Memorandum which it has laid before the Canadian Government proves that it regards the naval position as one of the extremest gravity and thus confirms the conclusions reached from independent study above. Yet, after this admission, it intends to make no special effort. No supplementary ships have been laid down, as they have been in Germany. No intimation has been given to the builders of warships now completing that these ships *must* be pressed forward at whatever pecuniary sacrifice. No increase is to be made in the naval programme of this year to counterbalance the new Austrian programme, and thus Mr. Churchill has broken another of his piecrust promises, for he pledged himself in July to lay down additional ships, and no other meaning can be read into the words he used. No attempt has been made to accelerate the completion of last year's programme, though our shipbuilding is heavily in arrears. The most trifling provision for airships is contemplated in the new Estimates.

But the object of this article is not merely to point out weaknesses; it is also to indicate precautions. Where the risk is so grave, the first step should be to approach the New Zealand Government and ask it to sanction the early return of the *New Zealand*. Such is the spirit of the people of New Zealand that we have not the slightest doubt as to their consent being given. The second step should be to see to it that the fourth battle squadron is kept in home waters during the autumn and that the four "Dreadnought" cruisers in the Mediterranean are moved for a time to Gibraltar, where they can at least run—they are too

few and too weak to fight. The third step should be to keep the Home Fleet as far as possible concentrated and at its maximum strength during the second half of the year. The fourth step should be to arm all our East Coast defences with guns to attack air craft, and with all possible speed to increase our aeroplane force. Airships we cannot buy or build in the time, though they should be taken in hand for the more distant future. The fifth step should be to offer premiums to contractors for the rapid completion of vessels building and to lay down forthwith at least twenty destroyers, with specially favourable terms for vessels which are completed by October next. If Germany can complete these vessels in six months, we should be able to build them at least as rapidly in such an emergency as this.

But, of course, nothing will be done. We may look next month for the usual worthless assurances that all is for the best. If the British nation escapes a naval Sedan it will not be through any virtue of its Government but through the energy and efforts of its allies.

NAVALIS

A NATION IN ARMS

BEING EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY OF A WAR CORRESPONDENT WITH THE BULGARIAN ARMY

ARJENLI (TURKEY), *November* 15.

IT is Friday, and we expect to-morrow the Battle of Chatalja. In the little Turkish village of Arjenli, situated on a high hill a little to the rear of the Bulgarian lines, is the ammunition park of the artillery, guarded by a small body of troops under Lieutenant Colonel Tchobanoff. Coming towards the front from Tcherloo, the fall of night and the weariness of my horses have compelled me to halt at Arjenli, and this officer and Dr. Neytchef give me a warm welcome to their little Mess. There are six members and for all, to sleep and to eat, one room. Three are officers, three have no commissions. With this nation in arms that is not an objection to a common table. Discipline is strict, but officers and soldiers are men and brothers when out of the ranks. Social position does not govern military position. I found sometimes the University professor and the bank manager without commissions, the peasant proprietor an officer. The whole nation has poured out its manhood for the war, from farm, field, factory, shop, bank, university and consulting-room.

Here at Arjenli on the eve of the decisive battle, I think over early incidents of the campaign. It is a curious fact that in all Bulgaria, I have met but one man who was young enough and well enough to fight and who had not enlisted. He had become an American subject, I believe, and so could not be compelled to serve. In America he had learned to be an "International Socialist," and so he did not volunteer. I believe he was unique. He should be engaged to lecture by British Radical Peace Societies. With half the population of London, Bulgaria had put 350,000 trained men under arms. But there was in the nation one good

Socialist who knew that war was an evil thing, and that it was better to sit down meekly under tyranny and give up your women-folk to violation than to take up arms.

The Bulgarians did not merely come into the field under a spasm of desperate patriotism and submit to slaughter by an enemy, as untrained men of England would in case of invasion. Knowing that war was inevitable, they had trained for war. I followed in the track of the victorious Third Army as it came down through the border mountains on to Kirk Kilisse then to Lule Burgas, then past Tcherloo to the Chatalja lines. At Arjenli I had overtaken them in time to see the final battle and now sat looking out on the entrenched armies, talking over the position with a serene and cheerful artillery officer. The past week had been one of hardship and horrors. From Tcherloo the road was lined with the bodies of the Turkish dead, still awaiting burial. Entering the Bulgarian lines on their right flank that morning, I had tried in vain to succour a soldier dying of the choleraic dysentery which had begun its ravages. But here in the middle of the battle line the atmosphere of noble confidence is inspiriting. The horrors of war vanish; only its glory shows. The men around me feel that they are engaged in a just war. They know that everything that man can do has been done. Proudly, cheerfully, they await the issue.

During the evening, a Turk suspected of being a spy is brought in for trial. He had attempted to rush past one of the sentries guarding the ammunition waggons. He is given a patient hearing, is able to establish his innocence and is allowed to go. There is no feeling of panic or injustice among these Bulgarians. I see the trial and its end (having been asked to act as friend of the accused). I muse on what will be the fate of some suspected spy coming before a court-martial of English untrained officers in the days of the Invasion, when the men with patriotism enough to volunteer at a crisis, but not patriotism enough to train beforehand, are being scattered like chaff before skilled troops. I muse and I fear. Justice and coolness are the children of strength and confidence. The English people of to-day are merciful and just. Will those qualities survive when disillusionment comes on the heels of panic?

It is to-day just forty days since the Bulgarian mobilisation,

At the call this trained nation was in arms in a day. The citizen soldiers hurried to the depots for their arms and uniforms. In one district the rumour that mobilisation had been authorised, was bruited abroad a day before the actual issue of the orders, and the depot was besieged by the peasants who had rushed in from their farms. The officer in charge could not give out the rifles, so the men lit fires, got food from the neighbours and camped around the depot until they were armed. Some navvies received their mobilisation orders on returning to their camp after ten hours' work at railway-building. They had supper and marched through the night to their respective headquarters. For one soldier, the march was twenty-four miles. The railway carriages were not adequate to bring all the men to their assigned centres. Some rode on the steps, on the roofs of carriages, on the buffers even.

At Stara Zagora, early in November I noted a mother of the people who had come to see some Turkish prisoners just brought in from Mustapha Pasha. To one she gave a cake. "They are hungry," she said. This woman had five men at the war, her four sons in the fighting-line, her husband under arms guarding a line of communication. She had sent them proudly. It was the boast of the Bulgarian women that not a tear was shed at the going away of the soldiers.

Later, at a little village outside Kirk Kilisse a young civil servant, an official of the Foreign Office, spoke of the war whilst we ate a dish of cheese and eggs. "It is a war," he said, "of the peasants and the intellectuals. It is not a war made by the politicians or the soldiers of the staff. That would be impossible. In our nation every soldier is a citizen and every citizen a soldier. There could not be a war, unless it were a war desired by the people. In my office it was with rage that some of the clerks heard that they must stay at Sofia, and not go to the front. We were all eager to take arms."

At Nova Zagora, travelling by a troop train carrying reserves to the front, I crossed a train bringing wounded from the battlefields. For some hours both trains were delayed. The men going to the front were decorated with flowers as though going to a feast. They filled the waiting time by dancing to the music of the national bagpipes and there joined in the dance such of

the wounded as could stand on their feet. There was no daunting these trained patriots.

These and a score of other pictures pass through my mind and explain Kirk Kilisse and Lule Burgas, and give confidence for the battle to come. Here was a people ranged for battle with the steady nerves and the stolid courage that come from tilling the soil, with the skill and the discipline that come from adequate training, with the fervent faith of a great patriotism. They face an army which began its training "when war was declared" (after our British Territorial system). I have talked with Turkish prisoners and found infantrymen who had been sent to the front after two days' training, gunners who had been drafted into a battery after ten days' drill. Such soldiers can only march to defeat.

ERMENIKIOI (Headquarters of the Third Bulgarian Army)
November 17 (*Sunday*).

The Battle of Chatalja has been opened. To-day, General Demetrieff rode out with his staff to the battlefield whilst the bells of a Christian church in this little village rang. The day was spent in artillery reconnaissance, the Bulgarian guns searching the Turkish entrenchments to discover their real strength. Only once during the day was the infantry employed; and then it was rather to take the place of artillery than to complete work begun by artillery. It seems to me that the Bulgarian forces have not enough big gun ammunition at the front. They are ten days from their base and shells must come up by ox-waggon the greater part of the way.

ERMENIKIOI, *November* 18.

This was a wild day on the Chatalja hills. Driving rain and mist swept over from the Black Sea, and at times obscured all the valley across which the battle raged. With but slight support from the artillery the Bulgarian infantry was sent again and again up to the Turkish entrenchments. Once a fort was taken but had to be abandoned again. The result of the day's fighting is indecisive. The Bulgarian forces have driven in the Turkish right flank a little, but have effected nothing against the central positions which bar the road to Constantinople. It is clear that the artillery is not well enough supplied with ammunition. There is a sprinkle of shells when there should be a flood. Gallant as

in the infantry it cannot win much ground faced by conditions such as the Light Brigade met at Balaclava.

ERMENIKIOI, *November* 19.

Operations have been suspended. Yesterday's cold and bitter weather has fanned to an epidemic the choleraic dysentery which had been creeping through the trenches. The casualties in the fighting had been heavy. "But for every wounded man who comes to the Hospitals," Colonel Jostoff, the chief of the staff, tells me, "there are ten who say 'I am ill.'" The Bulgarians recognise bitterly that in their otherwise fine organisation there has been one flaw, the medical service. Among this nation of peasant proprietors—sturdy, abstemious, moral, living in the main on wholemeal bread and water—illness was so rare that the medical service was but little regarded. Up to Chatalja confidence in the rude health of the peasants was justified. They passed through cold, hunger, fatigue and kept healthy. But ignorant of sanitary discipline, camped among the filthy Turkish villages, the choleraic dysentery passed from the Turkish trenches to theirs. There are 30,000 cases of illness and the healthy for the first time feel fear as they see the torments of the sick. The Bulgarians recognise that there must be a pause in the fighting whilst the hospital and sanitary service is reorganised.

. . . . . .

With that I close this diary. The patriotism which recognises that there is a duty to prepare for war had brought the Bulgarian army in a month from the frontier to the threshold of Constantinople. A little nation, with half the population of London, had put 350,000 trained men into the field and had chased the main Turkish army with slaughter to the very heel of Turkey-in-Europe. Then there was a check, mainly because in an otherwise perfect system of training, sanitation had been overlooked. From a military point of view, of course, it was almost impossible in any case that the Bulgarian army should have forced the Chatalja lines without a railway line to bring up ammunition from their base. It was however, an army which had been accustomed to do the impossible. But for the cholera I believe it would have got through to the walls of Constantinople. As it was, it made history and changed the map of Europe at the rate of a province a week.

FRANK FOX

A GREAT ARTIST AND HIS LITTLE CRITICS

Art journalists are apparently in no receptive mood just now for Fine Art. They seem to be suffering from the effects of Post-Impressionist poison which has left them anæmic. A little fresh air among sunny Roman villas in the Royal Academy, may ameliorate febrile conditions and calm nervous strain consequent upon too persistent proximity to an epidemic of dementia.

It may be advanced that "there is no smoke without fire." True, but whereas smoke from fire of cedar wood is sweetly scented and enjoyable, from rotten bones and old rags it is obnoxious. One is reminded of the oyster seller and his customer. "I don't think much of your oysters, they ain't got no flavour in 'em." Reply, "Wait till you get a bad-un." Some of the gentlemen of the Press seem to have been indulging themselves in obnoxious smoke and "strong" oysters; their olfactory nerves and their palates have been seasoned with offal. Let us examine the situation.

Journalistic opinion, unrelated to bare facts, from the point of view of influencing history is probably of little account, however amusing for the moment; yet if the ephemeral power it may lay claim to is abused it may, probably does, mislead a public anxious, more or less, to be put on a right track to judge, in the belief (wholly erroneous) that the authority it assumes is justified and final. The public, not knowing who the journalists are, may conceive the authority assumed is unbiassed, perhaps infallible, that the printed word proceeds from a kind of Olympian intelligence, and that the nod of favour or the reverse is impartial as the nod of Zeus. The more thoughtful, however, know that is not the case, and being independent because intelligent, they very

rightly judge for themselves and approach Literature and the other Arts unmoved by what is written by professional journalists. There is, however, a larger and less independent public always looking for a lead; among it are young people whose taste is in formation, and these, rightly or wrongly, look to the Press for guidance.

Probably a majority read only newspapers and are thinking that the written word proceeds from public-spirited, disinterested men, qualified to act as jury and judge uninfluenced by motives which control fashion and provide prominence. Fashion is a tyrannical mistress, breathing hot to day and cold to-morrow; at the same time she is seductive and fallacious, indiscriminating and sly, and may sweep round to-morrow from the creed she made yesterday. Fashions provide pitfalls for the unwary critic. If he be true to what should be a useful as well as a dignified business, he will be guarded against the habit of destruction, and will seek to maintain rather than destroy. But finding a problem before him full of difficulty he may easily fall into the easier method of disruption and destruction. Being elated by seeming success and a following of anarchists, he promptly assumes authority which, growing upon him, may lead to intellectual, even moral, suicide. Forming themselves into a ring, unwise Art journalists exploit their prejudices—a habit which becomes formidable—and people begin to ask what kind of people these new autocrats are. The answer is not seldom disconcerting.

By this time the arbiter is insensible to clear and right judgment, and becomes a mannerist in thought and its expression, and finally, when he is forced into the atmosphere of Fine Art, being by habit already biassed and prejudiced, he loses his way, gropes about and wonders what it is all about. By this time the arbiter has lost power to tell good art from bad. Having edified himself in an unknown tongue he ceases to edify others. The prophet has become a bungler; too confident of his seat upon a strange horse in a strange country he rushes his fences and comes a cropper: the indiscreet rider falls, and the old hunters laugh. So, the over-confident, accustomed to the antics of his usual steed, falls a victim under new conditions. To leave a metaphor. The journalist having accustomed himself to "nips" of poison in certain Galleries and in other haunts of

heedless experimenters, his taste has lost refinement, so, when Fine Art in the beauty of its restraint, in its completeness, and lasting value, discounting intoxicated egoism and "emotion," is presented the hallucinated critic sees indistinctly, writes incoherently and without discretion, and signs himself a failure.

In a measure one is sorry for him, for being committed to the charge of deranged Art, or having committed himself thereto, it is hard upon him to expect appreciation of sane and beautiful Art. He has vitiated his taste, and distorted his vision, in fact he is under an evil spell.

And this is the case of the moment, the Tadema exhibition, and the reason for the entire failure of the majority of journalists to see, much less to appreciate, the pure aim and the exquisite workmanship shown by half the life-work of one of the greatest painters in modern Europe. They have failed to see it! A chance for repentance of recent and growing follies has been given to them by a noble exhibition, a chance to reconsider the *parti pris* which they have adopted since incompetent and idle Art was drawn up from the cellars of Paris and advertised by a prophet who has spoken in an unknown tongue, without reason and without coherence. But apparently the journalist has been unable to avail himself of the opportunity for reasons which are apparent and which are best known to himself. Opinions have been expressed during the last few days by Art journalists, and in terms which, when not cynical, contained more than the elements of a sneer, which show an entire lack of perception for the Art of Painting and Design, and, I may add, a lack of that fairness, which surely should be a prominent part of a critic's equipment. The comments advanced regarding The Art of Tadema too often suggest willingness to wound but fear to strike. When the articles in question are not bristling with detraction, they are cold and almost wholly unsympathetic. The frigidity of approach to such warm-hearted Art, so enthusiastic in setting forward beauty in manifold shapes and tints, is noticeable in the article in the *Times*, which is, while well written, cold and colourless. I do not know who wrote it, but one conjectures from its style and tone it is the offspring of a judicial training sharply out of tune with an artistic temperament.

If the article comes from the same source as one recently

published in the *Times*, dealing with the new English Art Club in Suffolk Street, one is enlightened. A man cannot serve two masters! One expects, and not unreasonably, from the leading daily journal a wider outlook and a more appreciative approach than the Editor has provided; and at least an indication that an exceptional exhibition of pictures by an exceptional painter of world-wide reputation would have inspired the writer to as much enthusiasm in the later and important case, as the former and empirical one. But no! The writer made his choice and yet he does not appear sure of its validity; obviously however he is not on the side of the Angels, which is a pity, for he loses much profit and pleasure. Cynicism is catching. Notwithstanding the writer's skill, doubts of his own judgment crop up between the lines. After some laudation in terms, such as these: "Predilection for beautiful types," "beautiful surfaces" and "beautiful juxtaposition of colour," "we are left in the end doubtful as to whether all this technical accomplishment were, after all, quite worth while." Presently the writer appears to contradict himself in the peroration, for he writes: "Tadema's justification is to be found in the pleasure his work gave to a generation." Surely the function of Art is to give pleasure. Tadema chose to live mentally where the sun shines and to take us into a world teeming with life as our own is, so that Tadema did paint life which, save for its greater beauty in outward things, was like our own. Tadema recreated ancient life, anyhow some sides of it, a life still breathing to the imagination and in fact in existence in the South, hence to be accepted for the painter's Art. Tadema painted it with good taste, in scholarship, and in sympathy with all that was engaging and beautiful of it. He has made the past live again by his beautiful Art, so why carp at the choice? Because Tadema preferred to paint a Roman villa, garden, palace or shop animated by delightful groups, to a dirty London square, squalid streets and still more squalid groups of wretched, shivering humans, a back attic in Camden Town, Harrod's Stores, or busy Regent Street, it is claimed that he did not paint life; hence the writer in the *Times* questions the endurance of the great painter's work in the appreciation of other than his own generation. Surely that is begging the question. Why, instead of wasting time wondering what he would have done had he done otherwise, which is beside

the mark, why not be thankful for all the beauty Tadema has provided for the pleasure of dwellers in this grim city? But no! it is easier to find fault than to find merit, to carp than to appreciate; and yet, even with such qualifications, the *Times* article, cold as it is, preserves a certain dignity, and may be written by a man in possession of larger and more inspired outlook than is indicated in this instance.

The writer on Art for the *Morning Post* tells the public (who will disregard his statement) that "Tadema never produced a great painting, a work either in imagination or executive skill to rank with a Rembrandt or a Jan Vermeer of Delft." May the writer be reminded that comparison is not criticism, but as he has thrown down the glove, our answer to his challenge is that Tadema triumphed over pictorial difficulties, technical and of design, undreamed of by Rembrandt and Vermeer. It is useless to argue which is the greater of great men. Each one is great because of his qualities, because of his success in overcoming great difficulties. Tadema has visualised in paint effects of light in half-tone, achieved delicate relation of minor tints perhaps for the first time in painting.

He has revealed veiled sunlight, that kind of opalescent beauty of subdued not overshadowed sunlight only seen in southern climates, and this, among other things, he has done better than has been done before. Tadema was a great painter because what he set out to do he did splendidly! The writer in the *Morning Post* is honest and gives himself away with a *naïveté* unusual to a professional critic; he "admits the possibility of his lack of perception, to a limited idea of Art in its great phases," he also admits of such "shortcoming to the Grafton Galleries, and the deteriorating influence of the cinematograph craze." The worthy writer is correct. His vision, as well as his judgment, has been impaired by looking at too much bad Art; "you cannot touch pitch without being defiled." If this writer were to drop his conventional prejudice and reconsider his responsible position as an arbiter, he would repent and see straight again. Were not *The Observer* an old and rightly highly esteemed journal, the article on Tadema therein would not warrant any notice, favourable or the reverse. Its writer revels in paradox and likes to be startling; he speaks of Tadema's

"impeccable craftsmanship" and "unemotional erudition"; who ever heard of "emotional erudition"? According to Mr. Konnody the superb picture called "The Roses of Heliogabalus" is "a big lie made out of a multitude of little truths," which is nonsense of course! Further on in his amazing article, "The *fantastic* nonsense" (I quote the writer's words) "of Mr. Conder's" "Imperia," "presents a big significance" "truth made up of a multitude of little lies." One has to unlearn one's logic, if "fantastic nonsense" can present truth. Mr. Conder in his way was a clever fellow, but to present his Art in the same column with Tadema's is to belittle him; one does not compare a fantastic, elementary experimenter with a Master, master of himself and of his Art, except to challenge ridicule.

Mr. Konnody does not find suggestion of debauch in the noble picture by Tadema, he does find it in the experiment of Conder. Because Tadema the artist recalls to modern eyes all that was admirable and beautiful, and all that is deserving of permanence by Art in "The Roses of Heliogabalus," and suggests to the modern mind what amazing beauty accompanied a decadent Roman spectacle, and enchants by that refusing to present the ugly crimes and lust of Roman society, then the somewhat inclined decadent journalist is disappointed. He does not want the beauty, he does not even see it, he does not want to be reminded that under the decadence there was a survival of beauty under almost barbaric splendour, symbolised by Tadema in so poetic a fashion by the superbly painted mass of roses feet deep, suggesting exquisite scent and exquisite luxuriant gardens. If the writer chooses to do so, he can indulge his imagination with what may go on *sub rosa*, which Tadema wisely and artistically concealed as no subject for a serious artist. The greatest dramatists and artists have drawn a veil over crimes, the accidents of the ages, the distortions of noble human nature, as unworthy subjects for permanent presentation in form and colour. They come into the tragedy of life as accessories, which may appeal to decadent emotion, but find no home in the soul of a great artist. Mr. Konnody prefers fireworks to the calm beautiful light of day, and finds himself in a more congenial atmosphere in the Grafton Galleries than in the classic and purer air of Burlington House, where he is out of his range of vision and aptitude.

By now we all know pretty well the kind of Art which appeals to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, written under the initials G. R. H.; we are therefore not unprepared for the sententious approach of the writer to Fine Art. He loves not the Academy, its ideals, deeds, or members. He is an entire victim to prejudice. What he has written upon the occasion under review demonstrates his inability to see Fine Art; his "emotion" is kindled by another kind of expression, his "Masterpieces" agree with his temperament, which is more "emotional" and empirical than reasonable, critical, or artistic; so he is bewildered, and is like to one thrown upon his haunches before the Fine Art of Tadema. His extraordinary epithets do not fit, and he is at a loss how to use his style under new and higher circumstances than those in which he usually finds himself. However, again and again the loose term "emotion" appears, under which word so many journalists shelter themselves from closer analysis, This writer is not in search of sustained enthusiasm exemplified by perfect craftsmanship. Spasms of "emotion," a kind of tetanus and excessive nerve-strain, appeal to his undisguised prejudice. He prefers discords to concords; savagery, contortion and hideousness are the creeds of his gospel! These undesirable qualities he happily misses in the Art of Tadema which his pen finds no facility in reviewing. There is no sign in his writing of a haunting conscience which might indicate a road to repentance; arrogance stands in the way! Being unable, apparently, to avow his cause, he falls back on the assertion that "Tadema's case is one of conscience without temperament." Tadema without temperament, ye Gods! By which I suppose he means that Tadema was a sane and discreet genius, not a simian imitator whose antics caricature the *genus homo*; a man of refinement with a great sense of beauty quite out of his place in the anarchical crowd of "New Geniuses!" It is true that after some covert abuse and spleen, as much as he dare venture to display, this *arbiter elegantiarum* devotes five lines of patronising compliment under which lies a sneer: "Tadema's azure skies and blue seas often sweetly lighted his youths and maidens in their parti-coloured clothes, alluring in a dull climate." How *cheap* that is! G. R. H. is no doubt honest, but he is as blind to Fine Art as the Cyclops was to Ulysses when he tried to catch him. Yes, Mr. G. R. H.,

Tadema is "a painter dear to the Academy," because he did honour to the noble art of painting, and hence to the body of which he was so distinguished a member, as well as to his generation; and when the Fantoccini geniuses of the up-to-date critics are all sealed up in a box labelled "oblivion" Tadema will still be the great artist that he now is. In a long and discursive article in the *Daily Telegraph*, Sir Claude Phillips is characteristic—he neither "runs with the hare nor hunts with the hounds." We know by now that the artificialities of the French school of genre, of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, appeal most directly to his fastidious taste. Sir Claude Phillips asks the question: "What was Tadema's message?" Other questions he puts in the same paragraph, which he seems to answer in the negative! Sir Claude Phillips does not *see* Tadema's Art, he sees only something quite different to his own predilections; while he approaches it here and there with a kind of mild approval, one reads entire lack of sympathy. Very early in the article he tells us, "we must not *deride* Tadema, because his technique is not the technique of modern (Masters?) who now *hold the field*." Hold the field, do they? I deny it! There is a small clique of painters and journalists led by a false prophet who has raked up the worst products of decadent French Art, which is striving might and main to advertise it, and to bring into English Art alien principles and alien aims; that is all! Then Sir Claude Phillips tells us that "the world is weary of anecdote and genre painting—be it Egyptian, classical, barbaric, medieval, or modern." That is a large order and a very sweeping assertion to come from a cautious writer! Who tells us this? No one but a few journalists! We receive it *cum grano salis*. The larger public, sincere because it does not presume upon a little knowledge which is the habit of journalists to do, is still alive to beauty, and the Press has not and will never succeed in killing that instinct. The public will flock to see Tadema's work, they will be attracted by its beauty, and admire his Art in every variety of delight, so consummately disposed by a great painter. May I try to answer Sir Claude Phillips' question? Tadema's mission was to pass on beauty, to be quite true to his own ideals of it, to present it in no uncertain manner, to spare no pains to find it and reveal it in the smallest

mated to permit himself no affectations or meretricious tricks, to accept no mannerisms of rhythm, of shaping his design with conscious artificiality, but to be spontaneous and not academic. Tadema's mission goes further even than that, it is to demonstrate by splendid workmanship and unfailing skill that if a motive is worth painting at all, to permanently succeed and be permanently valuable, it must be perfectly visualised by a painter. And still further, Tadema's mission was and is to show the futility of exaggeration. When his Art represents tragedy, it is strong because it is deeply felt and not *overstated*. When his Art is lyrical, which it generally is, it is calmly beautiful and, in its way, Horatian. Tadema's subjects are mostly very simple, they play round the more delightful occupations which life presents. His Art is calm, not cold—whatever "emotion" pressed Tadema in the initial stage of a design which created the starting-point, the ground plan as it were, of the structure from which it grew, in the fulfilment of the structure not a single step or prop misses its point or place; enthusiasm prevailed while reason exacted intellectual restraint. Here and there, for who is always at his highest, Tadema failed to attain his ideal, but in such relative failures, folly is never visible.

Tadema guessed at nothing. He was a supreme visualiser. I state unreservedly that what his mind saw he visualised in design and by his fastidious and far-reaching command of every instrument of his trade, which is to say briefly, he was an Artist and craftsman.

It does not matter in the very least that he chose subjects which do not materially belong to our time—in the essence of life periods vanish; fashions change but the essence of life is unchangeable. Tadema's business was to show to the modern eye what ancient life in its beauty was like, and far-off romance was like, and he convinces, not the prejudiced, but the open-minded, because what he saw in his fertile imagination was real to him. The plea so much advanced, that Art must be a slave to its time, is a matter of preference and temperament and in no sense to be confused with an axiom. Tadema, of course, did not choose to paint modern life, and it is surely narrow-minded to censure his Art, because it does not fulfil the prejudices of a clique. Tadema delivered his message

to Art with enthusiasm and *absolute sincerity*. The reception of it has been, to say the least, ungrateful. I do not mean by the intelligent and open-minded public, but by prejudiced and narrow-minded journalists, who being in a paradoxical humour, having sold themselves to debased and bad Art, are terribly afraid of Masters, who those are I leave it for them to imagine. Being in search of "emotion" an unreliable affection, they have for a time lost sight of reason and confuse ambiguity and genius. Content with scratching for drawing, daubing for painting, and confusing rhythm (used as jargon) with spontaneous design, they have committed themselves to be chained to mannerisms, and to nurse conventions which they have invented. Some of our up-to-date journalists are committing artistic suicide, and one does not regret it. They are blind to high, refined and true Art in painting, under which lies a subtle sensitiveness to beauty of intention as well as realisation and "Representation." Being poisoned by his eloquent jargon as a special pleader, the up-to-date journalist has got into a quandary. He will presently be out of touch with his friends because he will have to trim his sails if he is to continue to exist. He is quite out of touch with the greater public and with all great and sincere artists; he has become the advertiser of a small clique of inefficient experimentalists. Every fresh exhibition of Post-Impressionism, and of the rubbish to which it has given birth, is a nail in the coffin of its adherents and advocates.

When the people cease to laugh and jeer and jibe, they will cease to find either amusement or profit in farcical Art, and the journalists will have to help demented advertisers to invent fresh gibberish to create a new crowd. And the last state of those men will be worse than the first.

Those who paint or write "with their tongues in their cheeks" are doomed to be found out and doomed to final failure.

No more wholesome, more opportune, more delightful, sure, practical protest against the rubbish which is so much advertised now as "vital Art," could have been conceived than the Tadema exhibition provides. It is more than a protest; it offers to students and lovers of Art a chance to make up their minds, definitely and decisively, if they intend to be led by a ring of Art journalists or by the works of a great artist.

The intelligent public, being at least sane, will adopt the right course; and as healthy public opinion finally does lead, the Editors and journalists will be wise if they open their eyes to facts and take off their blinkers.

Is that public prepared to advocate a still-born child which cannot cry, but has to be cried for? I believe not! We are tired, satiated with caricatures of great humanity under the titles of "emotion," "rhythm," "personality" and other jargon. We are tired of cynical laudation of ugliness, brutality, ineptitude and coarseness.

It is a very poor kind of journalistic art which depends for its attractiveness upon opening and displaying the sewers of life, in the direction of moral or physical decadence. To raise a laugh, to promote a jeer, to tickle unwholesome curiosity is little Art! Great Art has ever inspired a beautiful, even if sad and sometimes despondent outlook upon life in whatever way its varieties are manifest, and in which, unfortunately, the undesirable takes a place. Adjuncts are incidents in a great drama. The central and commanding interest in a Greek tragedy is the inevitable pursuit of Fate, not in the blood-shed or final scene of retributive justice which Fate demands. Great Art has invariably drawn a veil over the ugly and the undesirable; which being the result of disease or malformation are not worthy to be permanently presented by the Graphic Arts.

The great public will go to the exhibition of Tadema's pictures and enjoy the light which emanates from nearly every canvas, feel the tragedies as deeply as the artist felt them, and will respond to the love of nature in the artist's temperament, to his pantheistic worship of beauty in flowers, seas, gardens, and life of a bygone time. The sensitive public will feel the wholesome freshness, the purity of intention, the grasp of the painter upon his themes and his masterly exposition of them.

Beauty—which is indispensable to man's happiness; and beauty as revealed by Fine Art must in the long run win if there is a God in Heaven.

W. B. RICHMOND.

THE EARLY YEARS OF MADAME ROYALE

In the crowded literature arising out of the first French Revolution, Marie-Thérèse-Charlotte de France, otherwise Madame Royale, afterwards Duchesse d'Angoulême, and known to the popular historian as "the Orphan of the Temple"—has certainly not been neglected. Nor, even now, does the interest in her chequered and sorrowful life-story appear to be exhausted. As recently as 1907, in a volume entitled *La Fille de Louis XVI*, the tireless M. George Lenotre issued a number of hitherto unpublished papers relating to her early life, including a reprint, from the text of the Marquis Costa de Beauregard, of the original record which she herself drew up in October 1795, before she quitted the Temple—a document which had previously been given to the world from a transcript only. Two years later, in 1909, came the *Madame Duchesse d'Angoulême*, of M. Joseph Turquan, a work which has the advantage of covering her entire career. And, in the last few weeks have appeared at Paris two volumes which also substantially add to our knowledge: *Les Fiançailles de Madame Royale, et la première Année de son Séjour à Vienne*, by M. le Comte de Pimodan, a careful and sympathetic study based on fresh material preserved in the Imperial and Royal Archives of Vienna; and *Madame Royale: Sa Jeunesse, Son Mariage*, from the persuasive pen of M. Ernest Daudet.* The moment is therefore opportune for some brief survey of the subject as disclosed to the most modern research.

Madame Royale, the first child and only daughter of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, was born at Versailles on the 19th December 1778. The tradition of her earlier years, doubtless coloured by the circumstances of her after experiences, represents

* A translation of M. Daudet's book, by Mrs. Rodolph Stawell, is understood to be in preparation. The publisher is Mr. Heinemann.

her as, even in her girlhood, already unusually sedate, very reserved, and particularly alive to her high position as the descendant of Louis le Grand and the Empress Maria-Theresa. To these characteristics was presently added a growing air of sadness ("*la petite Madame est triste*," says a contemporary), which was not likely to diminish as time went on. Almost from her birth, the air was filled with disquieting premonitions of the forthcoming upheaval. In 1789, when she lost her brother, the first Dauphin, came the fall of the Bastille. She was then eleven. On the night of the subsequent 6th October she was roused suddenly to see her mother escaping half-dressed from the furious Femmes de la Halle, who slashed the vacant bed to tatters. With her parents and her brother she made that dreadful and humiliating progress from Versailles to Paris, in which the royal carriage was preceded by the pike-borne heads of murdered bodyguards. She took part too in the momentous but ill-managed flight to Varennes of June 1791; she was a witness of the attack of the 20th June 1792 on the Tuileries, and the terrible scenes in August following. Clinging to the Princess Elizabeth, and with the second Dauphin on the other side, listlessly kicking the dead autumn leaves, she walked in the mournful procession which made its way across the Tuileries gardens when the King sought unblessed sanctuary with the Legislative Assembly. Then came the long, stifling sojourn in the reporters' box of the Logographe, and the transfer of the whole of the party to the tender mercies of the Paris Commune. "How old is Mademoiselle?" a National guard had asked Marie Antoinette a few days before; and the Queen had answered, "She is of an age when such scenes are only too horrible!" As a matter of fact, she was not quite fourteen.

It was on Monday, the 13th August 1792, that the royal family of France entered the prison of the Temple; and in December 1795—more than three years later—Madame Royale was the sole survivor of the group. Her father, her mother, her aunt Elizabeth, had all perished on the scaffold, and her brother, the Dauphin (Louis XVII) was dead.* Of the King's fate

* Here we follow the official accounts. The "*Question Louis XVII*" is too large to be discussed in one note—or in many notes. But those who desire to trace to its latest stage the newest petition of the Naundorffs, will do well to consult *L'Affaire*

she had heard vaguely by the hoarse cries of the newsmen outside the Temple; but it was not until after the last-mentioned event had taken place on June 8, 1795, that she became acquainted with the full extent of her losses. Writing in 1796, shortly after she reached Vienna, to her uncle Louis XVIII, then in exile at Blankenburg in Brunswick, she says:

> You have no idea of the hardness of our prison. . . I myself, who have suffered so much from it, find it almost difficult to believe. My mother was ignorant of the existence of my brother who was lodged under her. My aunt and I knew nothing of the transfer of my mother to the Conciergerie, and of her subsequent death. I did not learn it until '95. My aunt was torn from me to be led to the scaffold. In vain I asked why we were separated. The door was shut and bolted without reply. My brother died in the room below me; I was equally uninformed. Finally I did not learn the merited fate of Robespierre, who has made such a noise in the world, until a year after. . . . One can form no idea of the cruelty of these people. But it must be admitted, my dear uncle, that after the death of this monster, my brother and I were better treated. We were given what was necessary, but without telling us what was happening, and not until after the death of my brother, did I learn all the horrors and cruelties committed during those three years.*

Nor is it necessary to recapitulate them now, especially since, for our present purpose, they are already sufficiently familiar in the well-known records of the two valets, Hue and Cléry, and in the "Memoir" drawn up in October 1795 by Madame Royale herself. After the departure from the Temple of the Princess Elizabeth on the 9th May 1794 and during the period which elapsed before the death of Robespierre on the 28th July following, Madame Royale remained under the same inexorable surveillance and in a solitude to which the greatest criminals were not then subjected. Once Robespierre appeared suddenly, looked at her disdainfully, but said nothing. Municipal officers, generally drunk, inspected her daily, spoke to her roughly, refused all information, and took no notice of her requests. Even after the Terror, when in consequence of the visit of Robespierre's adversary, Barras, somewhat gentler guardians were placed over her, the strictest

Naundorff: Le Rapport de M. Boissy d'Anglas, Sénateur, commenté et réfuté, by François Laurentie, Emile Paul, 1911, together with the recent communications of "Le Petit Homme Rouge" to the *Academy*. It should be added that M. de Pimodan, referring to the Dauphin's death, says expressly that he "has never found" in the Viennese archives "the smallest document relating in any way to the pretended survival of Louis XVII" (p. 2, n. 1).

* Daudet, pp. 18–19.

silence was remorselessly maintained. There seemed to be no hope of release.

With the death of Louis XVII in June 1795, however, the prospect suddenly brightened, and she was surprised on the 15th of that month by the unexpected entry into her room of Madame Hillaire Chanterenne, a young married woman of thirty, who had been appointed by the *Comité de Sûreté Générale* to act as her companion. The delight of the Princess may be imagined. Madame Chanterenne was prepossessing, sympathetic and well informed, and a close friendship speedily sprang up. Madame Chanterenne had been cautioned to be reticent as to the fates of the royal family, the boy-king in particular; but the counsel cannot have been rigidly observed, as she told Madame de Tourzel in September that Madame Royale was "*instruite de tous ses malheurs*,"* and we know from the Princess herself that she was made acquainted with many things after the death of Louis XVII. Subsequently to the advent of "*sa chère Renète*," as her new friend came soon to be called, she was allowed to receive other visitors: Hue, once the King's valet; her old governess, Madame de Tourzel, and the under-governess, Madame de Mackau.

Meanwhile negotiations for her release were slowly proceeding. It has been usually supposed that these originated with Marie Antoinette's nephew, Francis II, Emperor of Germany. But although the question of exchanging French prisoners for the royal family was not a new one, there had been no renewal of it at this date, and the true *causa causans* of the movement which began in June 1795—coupled of course with the weariness of bloodshed which was coming over the community in general—was a memorial addressed to the Convention by the town of Orléans praying for the release and restoration to her relatives of "*cette jeune innocente*," Marie-Thérèse-Charlotte de Bourbon. The outcome of this appeal was a vote of the Convention on the 30th June that Madame Royale should be handed over to Austria in exchange for four Conventionists given up to the Austrians by Dumouriez, and for certain other French prisoners.† In accordance with these arrangements, Madame Royale quitted the

* Lenotre, *La Fille de Louis XVI*, 1907, p. 67.

† One of these was Carlyle's "Old Dragoon" Drouet, who had arrested Louis XVI at Varennes, and who had subsequently become a member of the Convention for the department of la Marne.

Temple on the 18th-19th December. She had desired that she might be accompanied by Madame Chanterenne; but it had been stipulated on the Austrian side, that she should bring to Vienna no woman who had been domiciled with her at the Temple. She had therefore fallen back on Madame Mackau's daughter, the Marquise de Soucy. Another attendant was M. Hue, already mentioned, and there were three servants. She was in charge of a captain of gendarmes, named Méchin, and she travelled under the name of Sophie. On the 26th, near Basle, Méchin transferred her to a punctilious Austrian Polonius, the Prince de Gavre, whose instructions were to conduct her to the capital "*dans les bornes prescrites de l'incognito*," a protection which was not precisely armour of proof, as she was frequently recognised on the road, as indeed she had also been on her way to Basle. At Füssen, on the 30th, she was welcomed by her great-uncle, Prince Clement of Saxony, and his sister Cunegunde, the brother and sister of the mother of Louis XVI, who found her "as interesting as possible." At Innsbrück, a few days later, she was greeted by one of her mother's sisters, the Archduchess Elizabeth, Abbess of the Chapter of the town, who promised to say a daily *Pater* on her behalf, and assured her that she would be happy with her Austrian relatives. At Innsbrück an already-current report seems to have gained ground that she was to be married forthwith to the Archduke Charles, a younger brother of the Emperor. On the 9th January she reached Vienna. Madame de Soucy, by no means the most discreet of women, was not allowed to remain with her, a perhaps not unreasonable decision, seeing that Austria and the Republic were at war; and her place was taken by the Countess Josépha de Chanclos, a distinguished Austrian lady who had been *grande maîtresse* to the Emperor's eldest daughter. Hue, more inoffensive or more circumspect, was allowed to remain in Vienna.

Madame Royale's life in the imperial palace was secluded, and in a sense *surveillée*. For this there was the obvious pretext of her period of mourning, and no doubt also the necessity for ascertaining to what extent the horrors of her captivity, graphic details of which had been freely circulated in France during the last months of her detention,* had affected her health and character. But the question of her marriage came early to the front. In a letter of

* Pimodan, pp. 6-7.

August from Queen Caroline of Naples to her daughter, the Empress of Germany, it had been already suggested that the Count d'Artois's eldest son, the Duc d'Angoulême, or the Prince de Condé's grandson, the Duc d'Enghien, would make a suitable husband. At Innsbrück, as we have seen, a report had been circulated that she would not be averse from marrying the popular Archduke Charles. Between *Memoirs* written long after date, and letters which were either not sent or not received (however carefully they may have been copied at the post-office), it is difficult to decide at what particular moment of time Madame Royale became aware of these proposals for her future; or when she learned that her father and mother had once destined her for the Duc d'Angoulême, an arrangement in which her uncle, now known to royalists as Louis XVIII, of course heartily concurred. In any case, for Madame Royale the wishes of her parents at once became imperative commands. In a hitherto unpublished letter to the Duke's brother, the Duc de Berry, dated from Vienna on the 22nd January, 1796, she leaves no doubt as to her sentiments in this matter. "If Angoulême returns to the army of Condé, beg him from me to write to me, he ought to remember the wishes of our parents as to him and me, I shall never forget them, and I desire that they should come to pass as soon as possible." * Eight days later, in a letter to Louis XVIII, she is no less explicit:

SIRE,—I hope that Your Majesty has by this time received my portrait, it was done very hurriedly, and it is very like; I hope to be able one day to send you a drawing of my own; I work a great deal here; I draw, I read, I go out only to walk, this life pleases me greatly, it is the only one that suits my disposition, I love tranquillity, and to do my duties as I ought, I hate troubles and intrigue, which does not suit my age, I know nothing but to love you and to return to you heartily all that I owe you, and also to thank the Emperor from the bottom of my heart for my liberty and for the way in which he treats me, and on which I can but congratulate myself; all that has been said has not a word of truth, all is known, all explained, the Emperor knows the intention of my parents, and much approves it; never has he had any ideas opposed to yours he approves everything, but he thinks that now is not the time . . . The Innsbrück talk was nothing but infamous calumnies, and you have well judged by your letter of the 9th; † I am very tranquil at present, I confess to you; but pardon, I cannot tell you

* Pimodan, p. 43.

† This was a letter in which the King had instructed her to say, if any direct propositions were made to her, that she was engaged to her cousin, the Duc d'Angoulême, by her own wish and the will of the King, her uncle. It is quoted by M. Daudet in his third chapter, p. 52.

all to-day, it is Sunday, I must go to church for the benediction, adieu my dear Uncle, be, I pray you, quite at ease, and always love your niece who is entirely devoted to you, and ardently desires to receive your letters.

In a letter of the 2nd February following, Hue, writing to the King, tells a similar tale. After regretting circuitously that he is not able to console his Majesty for Madame Royale's failure to join him at Verona, he goes on to say that, in spite of what was said at Innsbrück, all the rumours concerning the marriage of Madame with an Archduke are without foundation. "The Emperor is goodness itself; his Majesty treats Madame with much friendship. He has given her one of the finest and most agreeable apartments of his palace. The Emperor does not mean to interfere with Madame's tastes in any way; she consequently enjoys with him all the liberty which befits Her Royal Highness's age and position." And then, the astute ex-valet hints tactfully that it would be well for Louis XVIII to signify to the Emperor that he has been fully advised of these amenities. From the Duke of Berry, then with Condé's army on the Rhine, came a letter saying that his father and brother were in Scotland [at Holyrood]; but assuring her on his own account that the Duke would be delighted to fulfil the "*devoir charmant*" of marrying his "*très chère Cousine*." Finally followed an epistle from Louis XVIII, who, as may be anticipated, is entirely satisfied with the turn affairs have taken. But as to the precise moment of the marriage, he was no more able to fix it than the Emperor, as he was awaiting political developments. Such, simply told, is the latest version of a marriage contract which has been made the nodus of so much ingenious speculation; and, as suggested by M. de Pimodan, it is quite conceivable that those concerned did no more than follow the trend of the situation from their respective points of view. Whatever had been in the air, the outcome at all events was, that about a fortnight after Madame Royale's arrival at Vienna, she was formally and definitely engaged to her cousin, the Duc d'Angoulême.

This matter set finally at rest, her so-called "claustration," if it existed, became less strict. She left off her mourning, began to take part in the entertainments of the Viennese Court, and even appeared with the royal family at the theatre. Whatever may have been the aloofness and austerity charged against her

in later years, there were no signs of it now. "Absolutely all the documents of the epoch"—says M. de Pimodan—"are unanimous in praising the grace of Madame Royale, her amiability, and the courteous facility of her elocution." Apart from the burning question of her marriage, her sole desire was to join at Rome her aunts, Madame Adelaide and Madame Victoire, the daughters of Louis XV, and to visit her uncle at Verona on her way. But events conspired to prolong her stay in Austria. Acting on the orders of the recently established French Directory, the Venetian Government notified Louis XVIII to vacate its dominions. This led him to take a step which he must have known by experience would be distasteful to Francis II: he joined the army of the Prince de Condé at Riegel. Although received with enthusiasm by the royalist troops, Austrian diplomacy could not suffer such a disturbing element to remain in the camp; and he was promptly informed by the cabinet of Vienna that if he did not depart it would be necessary to expel him. Repulsed here and there in different principalities, he found at last a tolerated resting-place at Blankenburg in the Duchy of Brunswick, where, for a brief space, he maintained a miniature court in three rooms hired from a brewer's widow. His wife, meanwhile, was living on sufferance in the bishopric of Passau in Bavaria. With September 1797 came the *coup d'état* (18th Fructidor) by which two members of the Directory were proscribed for the favouring of royalty—a step which made the restoration of the Bourbons farther off than ever; and not long afterwards the Duke of Brunswick was enjoined by the King of Prussia to get rid of his inconvenient guest as soon as possible. So stringent were the orders, that it was difficult to obtain even an eight days' delay; and in the middle of February 1798, the unfortunate Louis XVIII set out again, this time for Russia—where for some time he had been endeavouring to secure an asylum. The successor of Catherine II, Paul I, consented to receive him, and on the 23rd March, he took up his abode at Mittau in Courland.

Meanwhile Madame Royale continued to linger in Vienna. Her residence there has been styled an exile; sometimes an actual imprisonment. Exile from France it certainly amounted to; but in other respects she was, as compared with the rest of her relatives, in a state of comparative security. With the successes

of Bonaparte in Italy and the subsequent operations of the forces of the Directory in Germany, her marriage, once settled, fell, both with her uncle and Francis II, out of the range of urgent agenda. From her betrothed, lingering vaguely at Holyrood with his father, in the hope of joining in some expedition against France, she received occasional letters. But he was not a demonstrative person, and though respectful and affectionate, those of his communications which have been printed can be scarcely be said to palpitate with passion. As time went on, there are indications that, owing to Madame Royale's being continually forced by circumstances into the rôle of apologist or petitioner to the Emperor for one or other member of her scattered family, her position at the Viennese court became one of considerable difficulty. She heartily detested intrigue; and both Louis XVIII and his counsellor, d'Avaray, were masters of finesse (to give it the mildest name), while the King, moreover, was a very Micawber of the pen. Now and then, with a touch of decision which her isolated position makes more notable, she had the courage to resist propositions which did not accord with her principles. Her uncle, having addressed an open letter to the Abbé Edgeworth, the confessor of Louis XVI, desired that his niece should draw up a smilar epistle, affixing to it the date of her release from the Temple. But apart from the dissatisfaction with which she knew such a document would be regarded by the Emperor, she shrank from the deception of the date. "I will not conceal from you," she wrote, "that I should be sorry to antedate a letter; such a thing may be done by older persons [she does not wish to offend her uncle], and in cases which demand it: but it is part of my age and my character to be as simple and exact as truth." * There can be no doubt that differences of this kind did not tend to decrease the gloom which was gradually succeeding to the first exhilaration of her liberation from captivity. And, in addition to this, there was, at all events at first, another ever recurring source of embarrassment and regret. As the sole surviving representative of her family, Madame Royale naturally became the point of resort for all those petitioners whom the collapse of royalty had involved in its fall. Having nothing herself but her German pension, it was out of the question

* Pimodan, p. 78.

for her to comply with their appeals, and her almoner and intermediary, the Bishop of Nancy, La Fare, then at Vienna, must often have been hard put to it to find fresh forms of expressing the refusals which, however unwillingly, she had no option but to make.*

In 1799, after prolonged negotiations between the King and the Emperors of Russia and Germany, Madame Royale at last quitted Vienna to join Louis XVIII at Mittau, to which place he had summoned his wife, who arrived there on the 2nd of June. On the following day his niece, with a suite which included the faithful valets Hue and Cléry, made her appearance. The King had set off early in the morning. They were to meet at the first post-house; but the Princess, travelling faster, reached it before her uncle, and went farther along the road. As the two carriages neared, the occupants alighted. It was a meeting of many tears. Louis XVIII had not seen his niece since June 1791, at the outset of the flight to Varennes. At that date she was a girl of thirteen, while the cousin to whom she was now to be married was but three years older. In spite of her terrible experiences, she had now grown into a beautiful young woman, with much of the dignity and grace of her mother and grandmother; and, in her clear blue eyes and mournful smile, something of the saintly Princess Elizabeth. She was speedily presented to the Queen; the aged Abbé Edgeworth, then domiciled at Mittau; and the former bodyguard of her father, now in her uncle's service. But the person who must naturally have interested her most was her future husband, whose portrait, painted and written, she had already received from Louis XVIII. His qualities apparently were less showy than sterling. If not remarkable for wit or elegance, he is admitted to have been loyal and religious, with great courage and good sense. "His excellent principles and character cannot but contribute to make me happy"—she wrote to the Empress of Germany; but it must be confessed that he was

* Some of the cases were no doubt unreasonable or extortionate, but not a few were tragic. Take, for instance, that of Madame de Korff and her mother, Madame de Stegelmann, who had advanced all their means (262,000 francs) in aid of the equipment of the cumbrous Korff *berline*, which played so prominent a part in the frustrated flight to Varennes. When, with the captivity in the Temple, the interest on the debt ceased to be paid, the hapless lenders of the money became practically destitute, and it was only by the strictest economy that Madame Royale could render them inadequate assistance.

scarcely at the level of his destined bride. Seven days after her arrival at Mittau she married him, the marriage certificate being signed by the Czar, and deposited in the archives of the Russian senate.

At the little court in Courland the influence of the young duchess speedily made itself felt for good. "To see her," says a biographer, faintly echoing Steele's famous compliment, "was to be edified." But it was written that her troubles were soon to begin again. Suddenly, though perhaps not unexpectedly, the Czar, whom the whirligig of Time had brought over to the side of Bonaparte, ordered Louis XVIII to quit Russia forthwith, concurrently withdrawing his pension. It was the eve of the anniversary of the execution of Louis XVI, and the Duchess with difficulty obtained the two days' seclusion which she usually devoted to her father's memory. On the 22nd January 1801, she started for Memel with her uncle, her husband being with Condé's army.* With a few followers, they made their way painfully through Lithuania. They were almost penniless, and at Memel the Duchess had to raise money on her diamonds. Eventually, with Bonaparte's concurrence, they obtained leave from the King of Prussia to reside at Warsaw, on condition that Louis XVIII reduced his suite to a minimum, and took the title of the "Count de Lille." At Warsaw the Duke, who had distinguished himself as a soldier, rejoined his wife. Then came the assassination of Paul I; and his successor, Alexander, more clement to the exiles, renewed the subsidy, and invited them to return to Mittau. This, however they did not do until December 1804, when Bonaparte's influence with Prussia again obliged them to "move on."

The second residence in Courland had no marked incident except the death of the Abbé Edgeworth. After Eylau, many wounded French prisoners arrived in Mittau. Contagious fever broke out among them, and Edgeworth at once went to their assistance, only to succumb himself. He was nursed by the Duchess, who, regardless of her own risk, refused all aid; but he died in May 1807. A few months later, although Alexander refrained from openly harassing his guest, it became evident

* A contemporary print, circulated clandestinely in Paris, shows her travelling on foot with her uncle through a snowclad landscape. In another, she is called the "French Antigone"—Antigone being the name which Louis XVIII himself applied to her in a letter to the Prince de Condé.

that owing to his relations with Bonaparte, residence in Russia was no longer practicable, and Louis XVIII consequently resumed his wanderings. In October he embarked at Riga for Sweden, where Gustavus IV placed a frigate at his disposal. In this he sailed for England. He was an uninvited, and consequently not a very welcome, guest. The British Government were tired of the plotting of the *émigrés*, and on reaching Yarmouth he was officially informed that he must go to Holyrood. This, however, he firmly declined to do; and eventually, with Pitt's goodwill, an interim asylum was found for him at Gosfield Hall in Essex, an old Tudor mansion which had come to the first Marquess of Buckingham with his wife, Mary Nugent, the daughter of the Lord Clare to whom Goldsmith addressed the poem of the *Haunch of Venison*. It was a roomy building with a fine lake and park, in which latter the grateful exiles erected a votive temple to their host. This they encircled with five oaks, the first planted by the "Count de Lille," the second by his wife, the third by his niece, and the others by his two nephews, the Dukes of Angoulême and Berry, all of whom were now gathered on these hospitable shores.

In April 1809, the little colony, mainly with a view to get nearer London, moved to Hartwell House in Bucks, on the right hand of the road from Aylesbury to Thame. This they hired from the owner of the day, the Rev. Sir George Lee, for an annual rental of £500. Although Hartwell was spacious enough to be described as a place "wherein misery might be tolerably comfortable on £22,000 a year," the accommodation was necessarily inadequate for an establishment of some 150 persons, which occasionally increased to 200. The great panelled rooms with the carved ceilings had consequently to be subdivided, and sheds were erected in the grounds for the servants. The "Count de Lille's" own private apartment became a mere ship's cabin. But even in these conditions the formalities of Court life which had existed at Blankenburg and Mittau were maintained. The flag with the *fleurs de lis** still floated from the roof; Dukes posed as

* This is said to be still preserved at Hartwell House, where portraits of Louis XVIII and the Prince de Condé hang in the Queen's room. Elsewhere is the King's *prie-Dieu*. The apartments of the Duke and Duchess of Angoulême were at the south-east angle of the building. Under two worn stones in Hartwell Churchyard lie the Count de la Chapelle and Dr. Colichon, who died during the Hartwell occupation.

Captains of an imaginary Guard and Gentlemen of a contracted Bedchamber. The "Count de Lille," simple *particulier* though he professed to be, still made ceremonious progress from the drawing-room to the dining-room and back to the drawing-room again, his niece curtseying profoundly at his exits and entrances, while he as religiously kissed her hand. When, on rare occasions, he came to town to attend divine service at the little French chapel of the *émigrés* in Westminster, it was with all the accompaniments of quasi-royal state.

In the unpromising state of affairs on the Continent, all this, however, had become, if not a mockery, little more than a memory, and return to France a thing no longer to be dreamed of. Politics, indeed, ceased as a theme of conversation, which had fallen back on *belles-lettres*, history and languages, largely supplemented by the long stories of the master of the house, who had by this time reached the age when youthful recollections assume the proportions of Canterbury Tales. Something of vivacity was imported into this " set, gray life " by the vivacity of two clever women, Madame de Damas and Madame de Narbonne. But, on the whole, existence at Hartwell must have been hopelessly gloomy, and between an adoring but uninteresting husband and a gouty and garrulous uncle, the Duchess of Angoulême, serious by nature and saddened by circumstance, found her chief occupation in devotional exercises and good works. In 1810 a closer attention to Louis XVIII devolved on her by the death of her aunt, who, probably as an anti-Napoleonic manifestation, was buried by the English Government in Westminster Abbey with regal honours. Addressing pious exhortations on her deathbed to those about her, the poor lady is reported to have exclaimed to the Duchess, " As to you, my niece, you only want wings to carry you to heaven ! " *

For four more years the " Count de Lille " vegetated in his Buckinghamshire asylum. Then, at last, in 1813, came Leipzig, the fall of Bonaparte, and the surrender of Paris to the Allies. The Dukes of Angoulême and Berry hurriedly left England to favour, as they might, the royalist cause ; and shortly afterwards a coach with white cockades came dashing up the Hartwell

* Her remains were shortly afterwards transferred to the Cathedral at Cagliari. She was the daughter of the King of Sardinia, Victor Amadeus III.

evening containing a deputation from Bordeaux to announce the Restoration of the Bourbons. Next day but one followed official congratulations from the Prince Regent; and in the middle of the night the King, now *de facto*, roused his niece to tell her the good news.

His progress to London a day or two later was triumphal. At Stanmore the Prince Regent came to meet him with an equipage adorned not only with white cockades but with postillions in white coats and waistcoats. Over part of the route, the new monarch's vehicle was drawn by the excited populace, who took the horses from the shafts. Hyde Park and Piccadilly were thronged by enthusiasts; and it was not until seven o'clock that the King got to Grillion's Hotel, in Albemarle Street,* where he was to put up. The grateful speech which he made to the Prince Regent has been severely censured by French critics, who hold that his Majesty gave far too much credit to the part played by England in the Restoration. But his welcome in London had surely been such as might turn any one's head. A magnificent fête, "dazzling with lights and gilding," was given in the gallery at Carlton House. "Nothing," says one who was present, "could be finer . . . The Prince had invited not only the Princes and Princesses of England, but had taken particular care to collect about the King the faithful *émigrés*, those illustrious names of France who had afforded a distinguished example of self-devotion."† Louis XVIII also held a reception at Grillion's, Madame D'Arblay, as the wife of a French General Officer, being among those presented. She was greeted, according to her own account, with the utmost condescension, saluted as "Madame la Comtesse," and highly complimented on her works.‡ On the 24th April, the King left Dover in the *Royal Sovereign* for Calais, accompanied, of course, by his niece. On the 3rd of May, 1814, the Baron de Frénilly witnessed their grand entry into Paris by the Faubourg St. Denis in an open carriage with eight horses, Louis XVIII wearing a blue overcoat with gold epaulettes and an enormous three-cornered hat. He had celebrated his accession by a fit of

* Grillion's Hotel—probably by some pre-occupation with the "*premier capitaine du monde*" of Henri IV—is generally spoken of by Madame Royale's French biographers as "*l'hotel Crillon.*"   † *Memoirs of the Duchess de Gontaut*, Davies' trans. 1893, i, 145.

‡ *Diary, &c. of Madame d'Arblay*, 1905, vi, pp. 117, 133. She missed presentation to the Duchess, whom she saw afterwards at the Tuileries in February 1815.

the gout, seemed sadly tired,* and was apparently insensible to the shouts of joy that filled the air as he passed. "The Duchesse d'Angoulême was much more the object of public enthusiasm; but she looked stiff and unnatural in a new corset, and her naturally sad face recalled either the past or predicted the future."†

Here—following the example of the books on which we have most depended—we pause. M. de Pimodan stops at the betrothal; M. Daudet, at the marriage; M. Lenotre, at Vienna. To stretch the narrative a little farther, we have included the English residence, which closes with the first Restoration. But after this Madame Royale had nearly forty years to live before she died a childless widow, at Frohsdorf in Austria, on the 13th October 1851. Her exiles had not finished at Hartwell; and her life had been full of disappointments. There seems to be agreement that, as time went on, her character hardened; and that she lost much of that charitable spirit, which had prompted her, as a girl, to write on her prison-wall at the Temple: "*Mon Dieu, pardonnez à ceux qui ont fait périr mes parents.*" Certain it is, that her early experiences came to brood like a hateful nightmare on her later life. Every recollection brought with it a shudder of indescribable horror, and a passionate desire to blot out the details of her past sufferings. Still, she remains a great personality, who only required a fitting environment for expansion. She was a wonderful mixture of repressed natural sensibility and cultivated moral strength. Under trial she showed extraordinary equanimity; in emergency, unexpected decision. Piety, pride of race, a love of country, an unswerving sense of duty—all helped to mould her disposition. She had, one would think, some of the qualities of the grand Spanish saint who was her namesake. Both by her virtues and her misfortunes she stands at a far higher altitude than the smaller souls about her; and that adroit aphorist, Bonaparte, was not far wrong when he described her as "the only man of her family."

AUSTIN DOBSON.

* He was, by this time exceedingly stout, so stout indeed, that the portrait-painters of the day dared not draw him accurately lest they should be accused by the police of caricature. (*Early Married Life of Maria Josepha, Lady Stanley*, 1906, 2nd edn. p. 285, where the Duchess is described as "thin, genteel, grave and dignified.")

† *Memoirs of the Baron de Frénilly*, Lee's trans. 1909, 251.

ANOTHER ASPECT OF THE SERVANT PROBLEM

Lady Willoughby de Broke has recently contributed an excellent article to the *National Review* * throwing much light on the Domestic Servant Problem, that problem discussed year in and year out with much perplexity and more vapidity in almost every household in the kingdom in which one or more servants are kept. Small wonder too that this is so, for the peace of many of these households is seldom or never undisturbed by the raging fires of animosity, misunderstanding, and general misery which are the symptoms of the disease. Lady Willoughby de Broke's point of view is however rather that of the large householder who can speak from experience of the subtle social intricacies of the servants' hall and who knows the virtues and failings of the second footman and the under scullery-maid. Perhaps I may be allowed to contribute a few ideas from another standpoint, that of the employer of a small staff of maids in one of the lesser households of our country. Having started married life with a general servant and subsequently kept house with two and three maids, with frequent intervals of charwomen and temporary servants eked out by the assistance of morning boys and morning girls, I feel I know as much as most people on the question. Moreover I claim to have solved the problem for myself satisfactorily of late years by dint of much study and, I believe, a correct diagnosis of the chief cause of the disease.

While most fully endorsing all that Lady Willoughby de Broke says as to the need for more consideration and sympathy on the part of employers and better conditions generally for those employed, yet I feel that this is one of the side issues of the

* See the *National Review* for November 1912.

question. There are good, bad, and indifferent employers of domestic labour as there are in any other walk of life. The rock-bottom fact remains that there is a very widespread and by no means imaginary difficulty in obtaining good servants. By a good servant I imply one who is honest and truthful, clean and able to do methodically, carefully, and thoroughly the particular duties she undertakes. I do not mean a paragon. Those who expect paragons lead disappointed lives.

Now a very large percentage of the maids of to-day fail entirely from the point of view of capability, and a certain number also in the moral aspects. Very few cook-generals can be depended on from one day to another not to spoil a joint or other dish. They have no system, and though they may have prepared a dish perfectly three or four times, they will probably fail the fifth. They are not dependable, and the uncleanliness in habit and untidiness of person of many is heart-rending. House-parlourmaids are much the same, though their work being less exacting technically, its average execution may perhaps run higher. Still even so there is much left to be desired, and unless the mistress supervises turning out of rooms and similar duties it is likely to be a case of the outside of the cup and platter.

I hold very strongly that women are not one whit worse than they were twenty or thirty years ago: if this be so why should such things be? There is one fundamental cause: lack of training; the supplying of that deficiency will ensure the remedy. That is the seat of the evil, bad training or none. In the large households probably this is not the case, for the system of undermaids secures a training for young girls by the old experienced servants, and no one will deny that the class which goes into such service is quite a separate one from that which supplies domestic help to the enormous mass of smaller households. The former domestic service is practically a hereditary matter. It is a separate class with all its instincts going out to this sort of work. But in the small households for which I speak where are the maids trained? The girl leaves school at fourteen, or even thirteen, and has perhaps learnt some domestic knowledge there, perhaps not. At any rate her mind is then as active as it ever will be and has been through some training. What do you do with this girl

now? In nearly every case where domestic service is her ultimate goal she goes to what is called a morning place. This provides a breakfast and some two or three shillings per week, part of which may be saved to buy her an outfit in two, three, or four years' time, when she will be seventeen and some mistress will consider her fit for a regular place and a cap and apron.

The result should be obvious to any one with any powers of observation. The morning girl has to clean boots and knives, wash the doorsteps and run messages. She is not expected to think, probably is not even allowed to do so. Those boots must shine, and the doorstep must be spotless, but with that her work ends. Trained in three or four mechanical jobs, and to a dull and purposeless obedience to a superior who teaches nothing further and is in many cases not fit to command, instead of continuing the training and development of her mind which we have insisted on giving the girl in the elementary school, we let her roused faculties cease to exercise themselves and crush her dawning powers by starvation. We do not treat our own children thus, and having taken up responsibility in the matter of education of the poorer classes, that responsibility ought not to end with the elementary school. The elementary school with its free and compulsory education has replaced the working-class home as a training-ground. Incidentally it diverts a large proportion of those girls who once went to domestic service into other channels, notably those of factories, shops, small trades, and that shining vision of paradise, the teachers' training college. So while the number of girls available for such a thoroughly useful and sensible calling as domestic service becomes smaller and smaller, those who are left have had their early years given to an education which takes them to nothing. Though it is true that there are a few domestic continuation schools, and that some girls can and do avail themselves of these beneficially, the fact is that most of the girls on leaving school must work to earn their living, and the technical school cannot replace a proper apprenticeship in the domestic arts which could be given in any household if the mistress were willing now and again to take girls of fourteen and train them under her personal supervision. It may be argued that it is the parents' fault, not the mistresses', but I do not think so if the matter be taken as a whole. Very few mistresses will take a

girl under seventeen for regular house or kitchen work; they prefer to wait and get the ruined article, the girl no longer trainable, with all her powers of development arrested and stultified.

I know that this is so, for I have advertised for girls of fourteen to be trained in cooking and housework, and have been inundated with letters from parents and friends asking for a training for their girls. If a woman will give a small sum to provide a girl with some clothes (they are always willing to pay it back gradually if it be desired) and a certain amount of time to train her properly in her work, she may have a maid that will be an assistance and comfort to her, a maid who will be of some use in an emergency, and lastly a credit to her mistress in any future situation. Of course there are untrainable girls at fourteen, and alas too many degenerate and enfeebled ones, but my point is that a large percentage of those girls fit for training at this age will be unfit for it three years later, and until the age of seventeen very few of them will be given a chance.

The question is fully as urgent as that of "blind alley" occupations for boys of which so much earnest notice is taken of late. I say this advisedly, for the matter is of much wider import than the mere comfort of upper and middle-class households. It is a matter affecting the future generations of the largest section of the community. The working classes always look for the best wives and mothers in the ranks of domestic service, and if the standard of those ranks goes down, so will the homes of the working classes tend to a lower standard. Can those who cannot be trusted with any responsibility in the homes in which they are subordinate be expected to rule homes of their own satisfactorily? The two issues interact on each other to a dangerous extent.

I must ask forgiveness for the personal nature of this article, but I have long felt that it might be worth putting on record the experiences of a woman who has found it possible to have a comfortable, well-ordered home, with a satisfied and interested staff, by dint of trying the experiment she here suggests. In five years I have been obliged to change maids through unavoidable circumstances, such as health, but with the exception of two or three who were morally undesirable I have not had a girl I would not gladly welcome at any time to my home or who has not been a thorough cause of satisfaction. The question of morals is one by

itself and I fear that lying or stealing is not very curable after very early years, but take a girl of an upright character at fourteen, put her into training, and she will most centainly (unless deficient in some mental way) make a thoroughly reliable servant, fitted later on to become a good wife and mother rearing her children in self-respect.

Of course there are many mistresses, especially in the middle classes, who are incapable of training servants at all, but that opens up another and very serious problem, one for which I have now no space, but which is a matter calling for serious reflection and amendment by the upper and middle classes. Let those, however, who are in a position to do so make the experiment of taking girls earlier, at fourteen or fifteen, and I believe a great deal of the urgency of the problem will disappear. At least the capable will get good maids and for the others their blood be on their own heads. We in England might take a lesson from Scotland with great benefit. Scots servants are proverbially good, but then in a Scots household it is not considered other than dignified for each woman or girl to have some share in the work. The result is that those who teach have themselves learned what it is they have to impart by practical methods, and their lessons will be of lasting value.

In these days of so-called feminism and sentimental twaddle about man-made law and other supposed evils it would be a comfort if some of the women of England would turn their attention to the practical and highly important, though perhaps humdrum, subject of training our girls, the training not only of maids for service but of daughters for the management of the home every mother hopes her girls will have one day.

DOROTHY HOME McCALL.

AMERICAN AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON, *January* 10, 1913.

SIR EDWARD GREY'S protest against the discrimination sought to be imposed upon British ships using the Panama Canal, in violation of the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, which stipulated that the Canal should be open to vessels of all nations on terms of entire equality, meets with the approval of the American Press. In the language of the New York *Tribune*, "the tone is pitched low." The *Tribune* notes that "Sir Edward Grey even goes so far as to say that it is with extreme reluctance that the English Government objects to any part of the legislation of the United States about the use of the Panama Canal." It is that deferential attitude that is so pleasing to the American Press. It is all right for the United States to break a treaty, but it is quite another matter for the British Government to be "nasty" about it. In fact, it may protest, mildly, humbly, apologetically, with excuses for making any trouble, but it must not be "nasty."

The weakness of the British position is that no one takes the protest seriously or has the least fear of consequences. The men who passed the Canal Act, although they were warned at the time that it violated treaty rights, assume the attitude of the late Boss Tweed, who cynically asked, "What are you going to do about it?" What will England do if we refuse to arbitrate? they ask, and they supply their own answer. England will do nothing, they say, and they feel sure of their position. If the Senate refuses to arbitrate, England can do nothing. If Great Britain had a tariff, things might be different because few Americans would care to risk a tariff war; but as American goods can flood the British market in competition with British wares, no matter what discrimination is shown on this side of the Atlantic, Americans

need have no fear. Without a tariff a nation that engages in a diplomatic controversy is only half armed.

Meanwhile some Senators and a great many newspapers, and an even larger number of "intellectuals"—college presidents, clergymen, and men eminent in other walks of life—urge arbitration as the only course to clear the United States from the shame of entering into a treaty for its advantage and breaking it for its profit. A person unfamiliar with the American temperament or American politics, or at best only superficially acquainted with them, might reasonably enough convince himself that public sentiment was in favour of arbitration, and what public sentiment demands must be to the legislature a command. Unfortunately this is not always the case in the United States, nor is it always safe to believe that a few newspapers or a few persons whose positions give them a standing are really representative of the great body of public opinion. The opinion of London may not always be that of Liverpool, but men of a certain class in London are apt to think the same as those of their class in Liverpool, and the public sentiment of both cities will not greatly vary. It is different here. What is of moment to New York may be only of indifferent interest to California, or *vice versa ;* the interests of Boston are not always identical with those of San Francisco; so that a member of Congress is governed more by local than by general considerations, and influenced very largely by his own prejudices or reasoning. Thus at the present time the State of New York is represented in the Senate by Mr. Root, a Republican, and Mr. O'Gorman, a Democrat. Both are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but while Mr. Root holds firmly to the opinion that the United States must arbitrate the Canal question or stand disgraced, Mr. O'Gorman is even more firmly convinced that there is nothing to arbitrate and that the United States has as much right to discriminate against British shipping using the Canal as it has to levy a duty on British goods landed at an American custom-house. Both are men of high standing, character, and legal attainments. Mr. Root is one of the leaders of the New York Bar, and a former member of the Cabinet. Mr. O'Gorman is one of the most prominent members of the Democratic Party and a former member of the New York Bench. Mr. Root does not need resolutions passed by clergymen, educators, and

others to show him his duty; Mr. O'Gorman is uninfluenced by these resolutions.

Mr. Taft has let it be known that he is willing to submit the question to arbitration. That is what might be expected of Mr. Taft, and is in harmony with his character and all that he has done. Arbitration may be, as some people think it is, a fad and the folly of idealists, but at any rate Mr. Taft is sincere in his conviction that it is a good thing for mankind and is for the benefit of all the world. That an effective arbitration treaty between Great Britain and the United States is not now in existence is not the fault of Mr. Taft. He did the best he could and worked with courage and determination to secure what he aimed at, but in the conduct of foreign relations in the United States the Senate is more powerful than the Executive. A treaty that would have meant something was eviscerated before it was sent to the Senate because Mr. Taft knew that no other treaty stood the least chance of being assented to by the Senate, and there it was still further mutilated. If the decision rested with the President he would agree to arbitration without delay, but it is the Senate, and not the President, with whom the decision rests. And the Senate as it stands to-day is overwhelmingly against arbitration.

Although the Hague Tribunal exists for the purpose of judicially settling disputes between nations, and the Americans have prided themselves on the good example they have set the world by the frequent use they have made of that Court, the Senate is determined that no consideration will induce it to give its assent to the question being arbitrated there, and in this determination it is supported by a great many of the most influential newspapers. The reason The Hague is objected to is very simple. The Americans say that as the majority of judges would be Europeans representing nations whose interest in free tolls is fully equal to that of Great Britain, it would be impossible for the United States to receive justice at their hands, and to go to arbitration under these circumstances would be merely a waste of time, trouble, and expense. It might seem to unprejudiced persons that the Americans know they have such a bad case they do not dare to have it passed upon by an impartial tribunal, but one need not go too deeply into

that. It is sufficient that the Senate, or a majority at least, refuses to consent to arbitration if the decision is to be rendered by the Hague Tribunal.

Mr. Taft has therefore let it be known that he will consent to arbitration, provided that the arbitral court is constituted from the nationals of the two Powers, and that suggestion meets with the approval of a great many Senators. On the face of it that seems eminently fair. The Court would consist of three Americans and three Englishmen, one of whom, of course, and in all probability two, under the terms of the reference, would have to agree with the others to make the decision valid. If two of the American arbitrators agreed with the three British that the American position was untenable, surely even the most prejudiced American could not challenge the verdict; or, if the case was reversed, then the most obstinate and pugnacious Englishman could not question the justness of the decision. But like a great many other things excellent in theory there are practical defects, and a court of this character would not be the perfect instrument it seems to promise. If the treaty provided that the American arbitrators should be selected from the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the British members also to be Judges, no one could take exception; for the Justices of the Supreme Court are men of high character and great legal attainments, and may be safely trusted to decide the case on its merits and not to be governed by political considerations or expedients. But the Justices of the Supreme Court are not likely to be appointed, because they are opposed to members of the Bench acting as arbitrators, and the Court is now so overworked that the Justices have no time to give to outside duties. The members of the Court would have to be confirmed by the Senate, and the Senate is not apt to approve of the appointment of men about whose "patriotism" they feel uncertain. We have had one experience of this kind, and we ought to be careful before we invite another. When it was decided to settle the Alaska Boundary question by arbitration, it was provided that it should go before a court composed of the nationals of both parties. It was the understanding on the British side, although not formally expressed in the treaty, that the President would select as the American members of the Court Justices of the Supreme Court;

or, if they declined to serve, he would nominate Judges from the Federal Circuit Bench; but President Roosevelt appointed Secretary Root and Senators Lodge and Turner. The late Sir Michael Herbert, who was British Ambassador at the time and had negotiated the treaty, was very indignant and felt that he had been tricked, and he was at first inclined to recommend to the Government that it protest against the appointment of Senators Lodge and Turner, on the ground that they had publicly prejudged the case. A juror who has pronounced on the guilt of a defendant is disqualified for cause, and the same rule ought to apply to an arbitrator who has expressed his opinion before the evidence has been submitted.

Whether there is arbitration will depend on Mr. Wilson rather than on President Taft. The exchange of diplomatic notes will, in all probability, not be concluded before the Fourth of March; but even if the two Governments were able to agree on the reference to arbitration—which would be almost unheard-of haste in a matter of this kind—the Senate would refuse to take action in the last days of an Administration. It is argued (and properly so, it seems to me) that inasmuch as the country has repudiated the President and his Party, the disposition of a question so important should be left to the new President. The Democrats can easily enough prevent action, and this, I gather, it is their intention to do should President Taft transmit a treaty of arbitration. It would probably be wise on the part of the Foreign Office to take time enough to answer the note of the State Department—if it is delivered during the next few weeks—until after Mr. Wilson is inaugurated.

If Mr. Wilson is desirous to have the controversy referred to arbitration he may be able to win over the Senate, as the power of the President is very great, and especially that of a new President, when members of his own Party are anxious to win his regard; but even with the best intentions he will find the task no light one. What Mr. Wilson's views are on the subject no one knows. If he has given the matter any consideration he has not given expression to his convictions. During the campaign he refrained from discussing questions that were not the issues of the day, and the tariff and the trusts and personalities excluded

discussion of anything else. Since his election he has been asked once or twice to make public his views, but he has declined, and he has intimated that other subjects demanded more pressing attention. Men who know Mr. Wilson best say that his habit is to concern himself less with the future than to deal with the things of the present. Doubtless he thinks that so far as he is concerned the Panama Canal dispute is still in the future. He has enough to keep himself busy in administering the affairs of the State of New Jersey and selecting a Cabinet and mapping out a legislative programme for the new Congress.

Speaking of the Cabinet, it is perhaps fortunate that four months elapse between the election of the President and his assumption of office, for he requires nearly all that time to sift the conflicting claims of men ambitious to be his advisers. The way in which an American Cabinet is constituted seems peculiar to English ideas. In the first place, the President does not go to the Senate or House of Representatives for his Cabinet Ministers, as is the case in England, because it is very seldom that men prominent in Congress can be induced to exchange their seats in that body for a place at the Cabinet table. A Senator is more powerful and more independent than a Cabinet Minister, who has no freedom of action and very little opportunity to originate a policy, and whose tenure depends upon the somewhat precarious favour of the President. A Senator may disagree with the President as to policy and still remain on good terms with him, but if a member of the Cabinet is not in complete accord with the President he has no alternative but to resign. As the President must look elsewhere than to Congress for his Cabinet, he takes men whose "claims" entitle them to recognition or whose appointment is supposed to be politically advantageous, and he is required to make a fairly equal geographical distribution of the portfolios. As there are forty-eight States and only nine members of the Cabinet, they must represent broad geographical divisions rather than constituencies, and the effort is made to have the Cabinet representative of all sections, and avoiding, if possible, taking two members from the same or adjoining States. Usage permits the President to put in the Cabinet a personal friend or a man to whom he is under heavy political obligations,

such as the manager of his campaign or the man chiefly instrumental in bringing about his nomination, and he often takes a man of distinction in political or public affairs; but with these exceptions the majority of the members of the Cabinet are little known or quite unknown to the President before he invites them to accept portfolios.

Their names are brought to the President by their friends—usually Senators, Representatives, or Governors—who are sometimes disinterested and not infrequently selfish, for it is a shrewd stroke to shelve a dangerous rival by burying him in the Cabinet. In the early days of the Republic the Cabinet was the stepping-stone to the Presidency, but now it offers little hope of promotion, which is one reason why men who have already made their reputation are reluctant to close their careers by accepting a Cabinet appointment. If the Administration is a success, the President receives all the credit; if the Administration is a failure, the Cabinet has to share the blame. One of the amusing things while the Cabinet is in process of incubation is the effort made by small but ambitious men to be "mentioned" for Cabinet honours. The President-elect is compelled to listen to every one who feels qualified to tender him unsolicited advice, and a man whose vanity is tickled by reading in the newspapers that he is being "considered" for the Cabinet sends a friend to tell the President-elect of the great services that Smith has rendered to the Party or his extraordinary ability as a lawyer or financier or diplomat. Then, after having delivered himself of his message to the President-elect, the emissary, as if struggling not to reveal too much and hinting at the great secrets with which his bosom is charged, tells the waiting newspaper men that Smith will certainly be made a member of the Cabinet, and Smith basks in his fame. Men who resort to these tactics, or who induce the Amalgamated Society of Cobblers or the Fraternal Union of Bricklayers to adopt resolutions extolling their virtues and requesting the President to put them in the Cabinet and thereby show the high respect in which he holds the cobblers or the bricklayers (and that is a trick the political climber uses), seldom, it is gratifying to state, realise their ambition; but nearly every Cabinet contains men whose reputation is local and who are unknown to the country at large. In England, of course, it would be impossible for a man to be

made a member of the Cabinet who had not served his political apprenticeship, in America a man has often emerged from the obscurity of private life into the glare of the Cabinet; but in England the Cabinet is the Government and its members are always Members of Parliament, while in America the Cabinet is the creation of the President and exists at his pleasure, and its members are prohibited from sitting in either House of Congress.

In the course of a speech delivered at Staunton, Virginia, his birthplace, in celebration of his birthday, Mr. Wilson said some things that have given the people cause for thought and made cold chills run down the spines of many eminent persons. After referring to the responsibilities which were thrust upon the Presidency and the nature of the Presidential Office he said:

> This is not a rosewater affair. This is an office in which a man must put on his war paint. Fortunately I am not of such a visage as to mind marring it, and I do not care whether the war paint is becoming or not. It need not be worn with truculence. . . . There must be some good hard fighting, not only in the next four years, but in the next generation, in order that we may achieve the things that we have set out to achieve.

The business men of the United States, he said, were now discovering that they are not going to be allowed to make any money except for a *quid pro quo*, that they must render a service or get nothing, and that in the regulation of business the Government must determine whether what they are doing is a service, and that everything in business and politics is going to be reduced to this standard: "Are you giving anything to society when you want to take something out of society?"

The Conservative Press, or at least a section of it, has read this and similar speeches with consternation, and the New York *Herald* mournfully says:

> Many persons are enquiring whether the country is to have another Roosevelt in the White House. They are asking whether Bryan is to go there on March 4, under the name of Wilson. . . . We do not like to say so, but must a college professor always be a college professor, theoretical, didactic, dogmatic, impractical? A Chief Magistrate should not chase phantoms.

The *Herald* admits that "the country will applaud Mr. Wilson's display of courage," but it adds that his ideas "are calculated to cause a shiver of apprehension." The apprehensions of the *Herald* are not reflected in the columns of the New York *World*.

That the next President should put on his war paint is exactly what the voters of the country demanded when they elected Governor Wilson, is the opinion of the *World*, and it continues:

> If the Wilson Administration meets popular hopes it will not be a period of unbroken peace for Privilege and Plutocracy. It will not be a period of favouritism and bluster and bloodthirsty threats. It will be a period of honest performance, of good faith proved by works, of fearless enforcement of the law against big and little offenders, of lawful, orderly methods vigorously pursued without regard to politics or personalities. It will be terrible to wrong-doers because it will be just, and it will command public confidence by avoiding injustice and personal rancour.
>
> Governor Wilson will need to put on his war paint and wear it, because the conditions he will inherit as President call for a change, and because the interests and people responsible for them are thoroughly intrenched.

The New York *Sun* scoffs at Mr. Wilson's "service," "the sesame to which the golden doors open"; but the New York *Times*, while thinking that Mr. Wilson's high hopes may not be realised, sees that "here is implied a view of the functions of Government, and especially of the Government of the United States, to which the public mind is not accustomed, and which opens up infinite possibilities in many directions." Space will not permit further quotations, but the newspapers of the West, where the Radical sentiment is much stronger than it is in the East, and many of the South applaud Mr. Wilson and tell him that the country will support his new concept of government. This indicates a marked change in the Southern view. The South has been brought up in the school of Jeffersonian democracy, and it was the doctrine laid down by Jefferson that the best means to promote liberty and individual happiness was to give the individual all the "rights" to which he was entitled and to restrict governmental interference as much as possible. His theory was that the best governed State is the least governed State, and that the people must be left to their resources to work out their own destiny. Jefferson would have revolted at the idea of "social service," but the South of to-day accepts it as a necessary duty of Government and sees nothing to excite its apprehension in the policy outlined by Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Wilson has announced that, as President, he intends to institute two reforms, and as one of them reverses a long-cherished democratic custom it will be interesting to see whether a

Democratic President can strike a blow at democracy. He has said that he will not waste much of his time shaking the hands of his fellow citizens, and that he will ignore the precedent against the President being quoted. Much of the time and energy of the President is taken up with having to meet visitors from all over the country who come to Washington for a holiday and go to the White House so as to be able to tell their friends and neighbours on their return that they "met the President." Time which ought to be given to the consideration of matters of importance has to be thus senselessly wasted, and persons who have appointments with the President must often wait an hour or so in his ante-room because an excursion party has thronged into the White House, or the President good-naturedly, but against his better judgment, has promised a member of Congress to shake the hands of 300 members of the literary circle of the member's city or the graduating class of the high school. The President cannot discriminate without risking offence. If he receives excursionists from New York to-day, he cannot close the door in the face of a club from California to-morrow. The business of being "democratic" and telling perfect strangers how glad he is to see them goes on day after day until it has at last become such an intolerable burden that every President would escape from it if he felt he could do so and not subject himself to the stigma of being termed "aristocratic" or "exclusive," which is fatal to a politician in a democracy.

Without violating confidence no one may directly quote the President. The occupants of the White House are easily accessible and talk with considerable freedom, and while newspaper men are permitted to make public what the President says or thinks or proposes to do, it must always be impersonal. "A close friend of the President," or "a person in the confidence of the President," or "a high official of the Administration," or "a friend enjoying the intimacy of the President" are the euphemisms used, and while the initiated know the source of the inspiration the ordinary reader cannot determine whether an announcement is to be accepted on authority, or is merely the speculation of the correspondent. This freedom of intercourse between the President and the Press has many advantages, but at times it has almost greater disadvantages—for the journalist.

Some of the Presidents have been shrewd enough to use the Press to send up trial balloons; some Presidents have been known to change their minds—the result is that a journalist who has made an announcement without qualification, as he was entitled to after having received his information from the President himself, finds out a day or two later that the President has determined not to put into effect the policy he proposed, or has abandoned it because its reception has been condemned by public opinion.

Mr. Wilson has said that he proposes to have more direct dealing with the public and that when he has anything of importance to communicate it will be done either through the form of an official statement or a direct quotation rather than under the guise of the anonymous "friend." The public will lose nothing by the President's frankness.

A very notable decision was rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States last week, the effect of which is as important to Europe as it is to this country. For years a favourite device of reckless speculators possessed of great capital has been to "corner" the necessaries of life or commerce—corn, cotton, copper, or other commodities—and run up the price. In November 1910, after a shortage in the cotton crop, certain prominent speculators combined to corner all the available cotton in the market, the result being that cotton, which sold in November the year before for 13½ cents a pound, advanced in August to 20 cents, the highest price in fifty years or so, and Manchester spinners and others who needed cotton to turn into cloth and not to gamble with on the Cotton Exchange were obliged to purchase it at the price fixed by the speculative clique, which was so exorbitant that business was dislocated. Corners have always been morally reprobated but legally tolerated, because until the Supreme Court rendered its decision there was supposed to be no law to touch this form of speculation; but the Court now holds that under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act a corner is a combination in restraint of trade and its creators are subject to both civil and criminal prosecution. The defence of the men who engineered the corner, apart from technicalities, was that a corner, instead of restraining competition, stimulates it; but in the opinion of the Court, even if a corner does stimulate competition, it does so

in a manner as obnoxious as the suppression of competition; and it reaches the conclusion that persons engaging in a conspiracy which necessarily and directly produces the result which the statute is designed to prevent are properly chargeable with intending that result. Not only is a corner made criminal so that the men engaged in it can be punished, but under this decision any attempt to corner a commodity could quickly be frustrated, as the Government has power to apply for an injunction enjoining the proposed operation. Europe has enriched American speculators by being compelled to pay preposterous prices for cotton, corn, and copper, but that day is gone. It would be a very rash individual who would attempt another corner so long as the decision of the Supreme Court remains in force.

At the beginning of this year English was made the official language of the courts of the Philippines, which shows the progress American civilisation has made in the Islands. At the present time, according to the latest official report, more than 3,000,000 natives have some knowledge of English, and more Filipinos speak and write English than speak and write any other language. "The hope of developing any real idea of nationality among the Filipinos people in the future," the report says, "lies more probably in the spread of a common language than in any other one thing, and English offers the only hope to be raised in this respect." New as the Americans are as colonisers, they have at least grasped the salient fact that a common language is the greatest of all bonds, and that the language in which a man thinks makes him what he is. With the experience of the English with dual languages in Canada and South Africa it is not surprising that the Americans should give little encouragement to any other than English being the official language in the Philippines.

A. MAURICE LOW.

WINCHESTER AND THE DRY-FLY

I SHALL never forget my first sight of a trout. Always a keen fisher, my lines had been cast hitherto amongst the slimy inhabitants of East-Anglian pools; pike, perch, roach, bream and eels I was familiar with, and had passed many hours of my holidays watching a float on the still waters of a weedy pond. The butler had given me my first lessons in the handling of worms —butlers seem to take as naturally to fishing as they do to making the best brands of ginger-beer—and later I had been promoted to the company of my brothers. I had read of trout, but looked upon them as the rarest of British fishes, only to be found in the most favoured waters and to be caught by experts born under a more fortunate star than mine, and endowed with natural qualities I could never hope to acquire. For boys are determined believers in the immutability of natural qualities, and it never entered my head as possible to compete successfully, either in school or in games, with those more receptive or skilful than myself. They were a race apart, "jigs" we called them in our slang, a kind of supermen, whose superiority was as unquestioned as the march of the sun and gave rise to as little envy.

It will be readily understood that on the day of my arrival at Winchester I eagerly jumped at my brother's suggestion to have a look at the river. We hurried down towards St. Cross, and splashed cautiously across the water-meadow. The river lay before us in the month of April, gliding smooth and clear as crystal, bank-high over its white bed, the long weeds waving slowly in the stream. With bulging eyes I peered into its depths and, guided by my brother's finger, spotted my first trout. He lay in mid-stream, a good pound fish, every spot on him showing in the sun, and his tail was actually moving. I gasped with

excitement and nearly tumbled in, trying to get a better view. I wished to rush off and fetch a rod, heedless of the fact that he was not even in the College water and little realising that a charge of dynamite was my only hope of ever getting him on the bank. My brother explained matters and we continued our inspection; more fish were seen, and I returned to my house the happiest new-boy that ever went to a Public School, and with a love of the Hampshire streams which the passage of years and long absences abroad have only served to increase.

I cannot say that my fishing at school was a success from any point of view but that of enjoyment. The College water had deteriorated much from what it had been, but, apart from such deterioration, I started not only as a novice in *the art of dry-fly fishing, but absolutely* ignorant of fishing with a fly at all, so that, had the fishing been fully as good, my baskets could never have approached previous records, which were, indeed, little short of marvellous. As it was, my first two seasons were blank as regards takeable fish, though not as regards fish taken, for I did secure one half-pounder my second season and knocked him quickly on the head. I remember, even now, the surprise at his succumbing to a single blow; I had been accustomed to consider the struggle with pike or perch as only just beginning to be serious when the fish flopped into the boat.

It took me four years to realise that the middle of the day was the best time for dry-fly fishing in May and June. I was obsessed with my bottom-fishing experience and, even in my last half, used to climb out of the house at 4 A.M. and spend three hours on the banks of the Itchen before early school, in the company of a kindred spirit from another house. Those mornings were divine. Not a human being about and all sorts of shy birds to be seen and comparatively unsuspicious. A whole brood of wild ducks were often just below the school bathing sheds, and dabchicks kept popping up in places where they were never to be seen in the day.

We used to tramp back to our houses to change our boots before going down to "morning lines." If we arrived a few minutes early half the "men" were still in bed, and we roused the sluggards and made ourselves heartily loathed by our breezy

and wideawake voices. But we did not remain wideawake long ourselves and slept almost continually during school hours for the rest of the day. It was quite a favourite joke for the "don," in whose division I was by far the oldest inhabitant and therefore somewhat privileged, to close my Cicero or Euripides without my knowing it and put me on to construe after returning to his desk. The joke never palled, for the victim invariably sprang to his feet, and, after an exchange of side kicks with his neighbour, outraged by the unjust suspicion of having shut the book, tried to pretend he knew the place. These early morning excursions were, of course, quite fruitless; we never saw a fly on the water, no self-respecting dun would be out at such an hour, nor would an Itchen trout look at him if he were.

Dry-fly fishing has of late been discussed in several good books and in innumerable articles in magazines, and it is no longer shrouded in the mystery with which early devotees succeeded in enveloping it. There is, indeed, no mystery at all, and any really good wet-fly fisherman will catch more fish on a dry-fly after a few days than many a high and dry purist after the same number of years. The reason is that the purist is so taken up with the technique of his art, that he loses sight of the essentials of the sport; the other, on the contrary, is above all a fisherman, accustomed to seeing fish on the bank and skilful enough to adapt himself to his altered conditions.

Nothing is more surprising than success or failure in dry-fly fishing. One man appears to the eye the most finished expert conceivable, his line goes out straight as a die and falls as light as thistle-down at an astonishing distance; he matches the fly on the water to the nicest shade and is equipped down to a special fly-net, to be got at any first-rate tackle-shop for a mere trifle of thirty shillings. (Ten shillings extra for our patent nickle may-fly tweezer.) Another man appears to throw but a moderate line, his fishing generally lacks the finish of his rival's and his outfit is almost Turkish in its simplicity; yet, day after day all through the season, he will return with double or treble the number of trout in his creel. Almost every regular fisherman has met these two types and been puzzled to explain the failure of the one and the success of the other; he ends by concluding

that the apparently richly endowed sportsman is one of those individuals who never get their share of the shooting!

Beginners, as a rule, exaggerate the importance of skilful, and especially of long, casting, and don't thoroughly realise what constitutes effectiveness in this branch. A reasonable degree of skill in casting is, of course, essential to success. If you cannot cast, you cannot catch trout with a dry-fly, any more than you can play polo well if you cannot hit the ball; but neither casting nor hitting the ball is anything like half the game. It is certainly more useful to cast a short line really well than a long one moderately, and lightness is incomparably more important than length. Straightness, so much admired by the tyro, is often a positive disadvantage, for there are circumstances in which a light wobbly line, almost of the smoke-jack order, will rise a fish which a straight line would terrify by a drag. Some of the townsmen who fished the College water at Winchester threw the straightest and longest of lines with the fly going in like a buck-shot at the end; I admired their style beyond anything and modelled myself on it to the best of my ability, with the result that to this day I find it easier to cast a long line than a really short one.

Perhaps the greatest secret of success is the knowledge of what fish to attack. It is this knowledge, coupled with real keenness and energy, which is the main explanation of the success of the apparently moderate fishermen. When a number of trout are rising, the knowing eye spots at once which is most likely to take his fly. He is not led astray by an obvious rise in mid-stream, but settles down to the siege of a good fish who has emitted a single bubble in an almost unapproachable little bay amongst the rushes. He knows that this fish will probably take his fly if it is properly presented, while the other is almost sure to ignore it.

It is a vexed question whether, during a rise, a fish should be made the subject of a prolonged attack or whether it is better to pass on to another after the fly has been presented well half a dozen times or even less. Both schools of thought embrace very successful fishermen, and it is probably a matter of temperament rather than reason to which school one belongs. For my own part I find it physically impossible to tear myself away from a

good fish properly on the rise until I have either frightened him out of his wits or got him on the bank. I can never believe that I shall not have him next cast and if, perchance, I do, the feeling of triumph more than compensates for the half-hour, or even longer, of toil and monotony.

The two best fish I ever caught on the Itchen were taken one afternoon after a defence worthy of Todleben; they weighed 3¼ and 2¾ pounds respectively, and must each have surveyed the fly well over a hundred times before they made a mistake.

But whether it is a good thing or not to lay these long sieges, there can be no doubt that it is quite useless to patrol the stream like a stockbroker on the London to Brighton road. Yet in the quiet valleys of the Test or Itchen, it is no uncommon sight to see a man with a rod, apparently a fisherman, doing his four miles an hour along the treacherous bank, taking carriers and small fences in his stride and preceded by a wave like the wash of some distant liner. At the end of the day he has found his beat too small, the fish too shy and the rise too scanty, while his neighbour, who has moved only a few hundred yards all day, has a good basket.

Another vexed question, so vexed indeed that one hardly dares mention it, is that of flies. This is a subject that men wax really hot about; it raises the same kind of obscure passions as responded once to the theological disputes of the Byzantine period and to the present-day arguments as to the best size of shot to be used in a twelve-bore gun. I have seen a healthy man threatened with a fit of apoplexy at hearing some one refer to Sir Herbert Maxwell's well-known experiment with scarlet may-flies. Any one holding heterodox views on this question will do wisely to keep them to himself unless he knows his company really well; otherwise he may avoid open violence but he will hardly escape any milder expression of contempt and disgust. But a writer has advantages; no one can even throw his book at his head unless he buys it first—a consoling thought which even a publisher can appreciate.

How much fish can see and detect under water still remains doubtful, though some very interesting experiments reported in the *Field* tend to show that, always provided a fish and a human being possess the same kind of sight, a trout can, under

certain conditions of light, see the colours of a fly. The [illegible], therefore, who concluded, from Sir Herbert Maxwell's experiment and their own experience in observing objects against a high light, that fish were virtually colour-blind as far as flies were concerned, have received a shock. But the old-fashioned party, who assumed that fish could make out every colour under ordinary day conditions, find their position also somewhat shaken. The result is that, for once in a way, the moderate man looks like coming by his own. But, even if the fish is capable of distinguishing colours, it does not at all follow that his intelligence enables him to argue that, because a particular fly is not the exact colour of the natural fly then on the water, it is therefore inedible.

The divergency of view as to the seeing power and intelligence of trout finds its natural reflexion in the fly boxes of the partisans. The out-and-out believers in both—the stake and faggot brigade in short—carry a provision of both sexes and all stages of every variety of ephemera which is known on dry-fly waters. They are equipped with the net already mentioned, which tends to usurp the functions of the rod, and carry in addition a special pair of binoculars to detect any errant dun that may be unwary enough to show. They believe that the exact image of the natural fly then to be seen must be found; their own artificial is therefore rarely on the water at all, because it is continually in the process of being changed for one a shade greener, a trifle darker or a thought smaller. Whether these votaries catch much or little, there can be no doubt that they have a source of pleasure and interest which is not shared by the stalwart—the avowed atheist of the dry-fly world—who believes neither in the intelligence nor the colour-seeing power of the trout, and who carries in his box one or two varieties of fly, in perhaps two sizes. The ordinary man has the wishy-washy views of the half-hearted agnostic; he does not much believe in the discrimination of the trout, but he carries a fair selection of flies in his box in the same sort of spirit as he occasionally goes to church on Sunday. Most of them he never uses, except on days when no fish is to be caught by any fly, and he sticks to some half-dozen favourites on which he rings the changes.

I have endeavoured to form my own views on this all-im-

portant subject solely by the light of personal experience and am, therefore, unable to say whether fish see colours or what exact amount of intelligence they possess. In early days I considered the finding of the "right fly" as of transcendent importance and never failed to inquire of any fellow fisherman on the College water what fly he had on. If only the "right fly" could be found, I believed that success was absolutely assured; the fish were, in fact, as good as cooked, whether they were rising or lying like stones at the bottom of the river. For one whole season I used hardly anything but a hare's ear, because I secured my first good fish, a beauty of $1\frac{3}{4}$ pounds, on a fly of that pattern. To this day I am not sure whether I ever saw him rise before he was hooked. Several trout were rising in the fast water twenty yards below the school bathing-place and I was distinctly vague as to the exact position of my fly when it fell. But the fish was landed right enough by my favourite "socius" in bird's nesting and catapulting expeditions; he was no fisherman, but handled the net more coolly and surely than many a professional I have met since.

Since those days I have used fewer flies year by year and, the last two seasons which I have fished in Hampshire, I have put on hardly anything but a red or a grey quill, though I still carry others in my box. One thing is quite certain, that a change of fly will often secure an otherwise recalcitrant fish. Often have I fished for twenty minutes or so for a fish without getting a rise, and had him first cast with a new fly. But the change with me takes the form of a smaller or a larger size; either will do on occasion, and I am not sure that a mere change of the individual fly is not all that is required, and that another of the same size and pattern would not do equally well. All that is clear to me is, that the trout knows that there is something wrong with that particular fly and will not take it.

There is moreover a moral aspect to this question which cannot be overlooked. The first condition of success is a recognition of one's own errors and a stern resolve to fight against the insidious tendency to blame everything for failure except oneself. No doubt men of tough moral fibre can regard the identity of the fly at the end of their cast as important and still preserve the power of discerning and blaming their own shortcomings, but

weaker vessels would do better to make up their minds that the fly is of little consequence and thus eliminate from the outset the usual scapegoat for bad fishing; they will still have more excuses than they need. It is notorious that men who have drunk too much in their youth had better take the pledge, and I rest content in the belief, perhaps erroneous, that I catch as many fish as any one who is not obviously a better fisherman than myself.

Nowadays the Hampshire valleys do not lack for admirers, but surely to no one do they make quite the same appeal as to an Englishman who has spent long spells abroad in wild and uncouth countries. To such a one the homely beauty of the cottages, with their gay flowers beside the well-kept road, the rich water-meadows and the lazy cattle beneath the tall trees all speak of hundreds of years of settled government and peaceful pursuits.

The very river, too, brimful on the hottest day at the end of a long drought, has an air of certainty and security which no torrent can share. He hears the familiar tones of the country people amongst the hay, the drumming of the snipe in the soft air, and the cries of the well-known birds from sedge and willow; and it seems to him that this indeed is the England of his devotion. When Junes come round in a distant land, I conjure up a certain broad reach of the Test; the sinking sun shines right down the river and throws long shadows from a row of old oak posts which mark a forgotten ford; the rushes in the little bays are already in shadow and cut like steel the glassy surface of the water which is broken here and there by a widening ring; the swifts are still hawking in the golden air, and in mid-stream stands a familiar figure, the companion of many a happy day in the beloved valley.

FRANCIS LINDLEY.

AUSTRALIA AND IMPERIAL NAVAL DEFENCE

A DISCUSSION of Australia's defence at sea and the Australian naval policy presents two aspects which many Englishmen find not easy to combine—the Imperial aspect and the local aspect. Imperial policy, that command of the seas which has always been the British heritage, demands an increase of our naval power in the Pacific. Australian security has been admitted by the Admiralty at home here to demand a local fleet. Only the future can show how the Australian Navy, whose first small units are already flying their flag in the Pacific, will play the double rôle. But at this critical time, as that navy is being launched on its career, both the Admiralty and the Australian authorities have a most delicate position in prospect. Signs are evident that each party realises that position, and every Englishman will hope that both on this side of the world and on the other the coming generation will produce statesmen great-minded enough to control it.

To begin with, consider the Pacific to-day. We stand at the opening of a new epoch in the world's development in which the Pacific, say the prophets, is to play a leading part. Hitherto the Pacific has been a sort of neutral ocean, nominally under the suzerainty of Britain, but only nominally. The Great Powers of Europe, which have wrangled and wrestled for centuries everywhere else, have never fought here. Here alone, perhaps because their advent has been comparatively only recent, have they been content with patrol ships to watch the activity of their respective merchantmen in a trade which, undeveloped as it was and is, has nevertheless been enough for all. The colonisation and conquest of Pacific regions from Europe has been almost entirely without bloodshed, for the indigenous tribes were mainly

but ancient and backward people. The acquisition and friendly division of trade was easy where opportunities were so vast and so responsive. Besides, competition for that trade among the European Powers is only now beginning. Cortes stood on this mighty ocean's edge four hundred years ago, about the same time as Magellan entered it from the south, and the advent of these two historic figures reveals, with the romantic search for the North-West Passage to the Indies, an early instinct in hardy adventurers from the Old World of the wealth the Pacific offered in the New. But the discovery of the Pacific was checked, just at its likely moment, by the incidental discovery of the Americas. The riches of these two wonderful continents which straggle all the way down the map to divide the known ocean from the unknown sufficed to keep Europe from becoming really interested in the Pacific for four centuries. That long-delayed interest is now awakened, and a new chapter of the world's history and of the rivalry of its nations undoubtedly opens in our time. Hitherto the recorded commercial and political development in these seas—the East Indies are of course relatively only a very small part of this new ocean world—has been, as I have said, almost entirely peaceful. Then suddenly, within one decade, there came a startling and illuminating change. Over this tranquil, unfathomed, unransacked sea war clouds burst from each side in rapid succession. The American Fleet shattered the whole Pacific power of Spain in a day at Manila; the Japanese annihilated the Russian Navy in the yellow seas. The results were not only the removal of two European naval Powers from their Pacific outposts, but further the rise of two home Pacific naval Powers to indisputable numerical predominance over all the nations here represented.*

A proper realisation of these results will help people at home

* It is interesting to set out here the strengths of naval Powers in the Pacific. Great Britain has four armoured cruisers (including the *Indomitable*) of about 50,000 tonnage; United States six, of 81,500 tonnage; Germany two, of 23,000 tons; France two, of 15,000 tons. Japan is the only Power owning any battleships in these waters at all, and she has twenty-nine heavy armoured ships (twenty battleships and battle cruisers), and has also seven Dreadnoughts building. Japan is further reported to be beginning a big construction programme, which should give her (if carried out as proposed) thirty-three capital fighting ships—twenty-seven of them Dreadnoughts—in 1921.

in England to realise Australia's position and her rapidly developing consciousness of insecurity. The presentment of Australia's case, however, is not complete without a view of her geographical situation. She stands certainly on the western side of the Pacific, but her position is really central, for the Indian Ocean can by no means be neglected in the general survey. The archipelago to the north separates these oceans, but the huge empty polar seas to the south unite them. Though a whole continent, in territorial expanse nearly as big as Europe, Australia, an island set in the midst of this world of waters, is quite dwarfed by their immensity. Australia, from her very position, is meant by Nature to have the maritime command of this hemisphere. She is the real key to the Pacific, in spite of the Panama Canal. The Suez Canal on the other side, held in the past by England for the sake of India, must be retained in the future equally for the sake of Australia and the ocean beyond India. At Australia both these strategic maritime approaches from the Old World seem to be directly aimed. The main trade-routes of the southern hemisphere run or will run past Australia's coasts. She could produce all the food-supplies the Pacific peoples want. She is the half-way house between India, Africa, and the two Americas. And, it is important to add, the Pacific Powers know it.

So much for the natural position and the growing international interest which emphasises it. Meanwhile, concurrently with the advance of Pacific politics generally to the front, Australia's own prosperity has increased, within the past decade especially, in almost fabulous manner. Her natural wealth, long hidden—or perhaps, rather, quite visible and waiting to be used—appears now at the tapping so enormous that even Australians themselves do not fully perceive it. It must be remembered, too, from the outset of this survey that the population planted on Australia's 2,800,000 square miles, is to-day only 4,700,000 (almost entirely British stock). The north of this Dominion is quite empty; the west but barely held, and then only in the southern corner; and the bulk of the people cling about the richer districts of the south-eastern and eastern coasts. It is a tribute equally to the agricultural responsiveness of the land, and to the industry of the mere handful of people who are developing it, that Australia's oversea trade last year was worth about 150 millions sterling. This does not include

local maritime interchange between the States, which brings the total floating trade up to nearly 200 millions. Australia's trade has more than doubled itself during the last thirteen years. Any one who wishes to satisfy himself in the details of this remarkable economic growth may do so from official statistics which are readily available.

The arousal of a new national spirit in Australia will now perhaps appear more easily explicable to Englishmen at home. For the growth of the young Commonwealth has not been material alone. It is not too much to say that nowhere in the King's Dominions is the new Imperial spirit more alive and in earnest than among the Australian people. Without allowing ourselves to be carried away from sane precaution into alarm, we must surely feel some instinctive warning when we see this important Empire outpost, peaceful, thriving, never having known war as every other part of our Dominions has, suddenly begin the most warlike preparations on sea and land in a perfect fever of martial enthusiasm. Australia is the first country of the Empire to set up compulsory manhood training for war. She is the first of the colonial Dominions to establish a local fleet auxiliary to the Home Navy.

Neglecting for the moment the raising of her new Army, the Young Guard as it has been called locally, let us turn to the launching of the Fleet. The Imperial Defence Conference of 1909, to which all the Dominions sent representatives, spent a considerable part of its time in discussing the defence of the Pacific, and, acquiescing in an urgent demand from Australia for a locally owned fleet, it agreed to a new naval establishment in those waters. Australia wished to build and man a Fleet Unit for the Australian coast, and it was agreed that the Admiralty should furnish two similar Fleet Units, one for the East Indies station and one for the China station. Canada was to provide a similar naval force; but the defeat of the Laurier Government called a halt in that arrangement, and the Borden Government announced that the naval policy of Canada was to be reconsidered. Each of these fleet units was to consist of one first-class and three second-class cruisers and six destroyers. The Australian unit is now nearly completed. Three destroyers are commissioned in Australian waters; the *Australia* (an improved "Invincible" of

in coastal areas the boys are electing for the naval arm of the service with great enthusiasm. Already there are 3225 cadets training for the Citizen Naval Forces Reserve. The Naval College at Jervis Bay for midshipmen-cadets will provide for 150 young officers; but, in order not to delay the training scheme, Osborne House at Geelong, near Melbourne, has been equipped for the meantime, and the first entry of twenty-four cadets will be made here this February. The college regulations are modelled on those of the Royal Naval Colleges at Osborne and Dartmouth, so that the Home Navy curriculum may be followed as far as possible; the authorities have also made arrangements for some naval cadets to study in England, as young Australians frequently have done in past years. It is interesting to note, too, that the new Australian Naval Board, the administrative body, which has been in existence now about a year and a half, is in constitution almost an exact replica of the Admiralty here at home. The Minister for Defence is the non-professional head of the department and is responsible, of course, to Parliament; the First Naval Member has charge of war preparations, intelligence, manœuvres, and naval works; the Second Naval Member, of personnel, discipline, and stores; the Third Naval Member, of construction, repairs, and control of dockyards; and there is also a Finance and Civil Member, who is secretary to the Board.

The Australian Fleet is (on paper) now in being, and very shortly the first instalment of the actual ships will be patrolling the Pacific, flying both the White Ensign and the Starred Blue Ensign which is the Australian Flag. The interesting question arises of course—Is there to be dual control? are Imperial needs and the local needs equally served by the one force? The only answer that can be given to-day is "Yes and No." It can of course never be so satisfactory to the Admiralty that ships flying the White Ensign in the Pacific shall be under any other control whatever, no matter how elastic that control may be. To the extent that there is an Australian Naval Board, directing the Australian Fleet, we have dual control. But then, what else is possible? We cannot remedy the dispositions of heaven and geography: Australia is at the other end of the earth; and, though the submarine cable and wireless telegraphy have eliminated time, they cannot similarly dispose of space. Centralisation in other

things than naval direction is every day breaking down. The self-responsible spirit which we have always so liberally cultivated in the Overseas Dominions, and which has built up the British nation as the finest colonial Power the world has seen—this self-responsible spirit in the Dominions demands some meed of local control of the fleets and armies they are so enthusiastically raising against the Empire's need. England must have them; and to that end she must give as well as take.

And, after all, there is probably nothing so very highly dangerous in this dual control. One may admit the sound old argument, proved over and over again by Nelson and his admirals against the fleets of France and Spain, that allied fleets are weak fleets—one may admit it, and still protest that in our Imperial naval policy safeguards for the future are provided. The Conference at Whitehall in 1911 between the Admiralty and naval representatives of Canada and Australia drew up a Memorandum of which two vital clauses read:

> 15. It is desirable, in the interests of efficiency and co-operation, that arrangements should be made from time to time between the British Admiralty and the Dominions for the ships of the Dominions to take part in fleet exercises, or for any other joint training considered necessary, under the Senior Naval Officer (of whichever fleet). While so employed the ships will be under the command of that officer, who will not, however, interfere in the internal economy of ships of another service further than absolutely necessary.
>
> 16. In time of war, when the naval service of a Dominion, or any part thereof, has been put at the disposal of the Imperial Government by the Dominion authorities, the ships will form an integral part of the British Fleet, and will remain under the control of the British Admiralty during the continuance of the war.

As it stands, the Memorandum, admittedly, does not say anywhere that Dominion fleets shall automatically become units of the Home Navy on the outbreak of war, but it is submitted that such a clause is not required. Either we trust Australian loyalty or we do not; if we do not, no clause in any agreement possibly contrivable could secure us Australia's co-operation at need. If we cannot trust Australia, can we then trust Scotland, or Yorkshire, or Devon?

At any rate, if it could be held for a moment that the readiness Britain has shown to meet the Dominions' desires and sympathise with them has not assured their loyalty, we may comfort ourselves with the reflection that we have deserved it. To-day, at least, there is no sign of the absence of that loyalty. Australia recognises

and hails cheerily the birth of a new era in Imperial relations and responsibilities. The outer Dominions of the Empire are keenly awake to the reality of disturbed equilibrium in the world generally, and as the Empire is affected particularly. The old Anglo-Saxon dominion, built up on command of the narrow seas, is dying. Command of the seas means inevitably what it literally spells—command of all the seas. The new dominion, or the newer phase of the old, must be a stronger, wider dominion. The same old Britain is conscious of a challenge to-day simply because the old force is no longer sufficient. Her general supremacy will no longer be allowed to rest on a purely local supremacy. She is challenged at home because she is challenged abroad: to the farthest limits of the seas the same question rings out. Our Empire, if it is to stand, demands a broader base. We feel that it rests secure no longer on a centre point alone. The crisis may possibly arise on the other side of the world and the decisive conflict be settled over there. Or if not that, if the Home Seas are in truth the danger-zone, the struggle may spread beyond our strength to confine it there—beyond, that is to say, our real and actual sea command. The Flag must fly and be maintained in all its proud precedence and honour in the outer seas as well as the inner. And nowhere in the Empire is this realised with truer insight and greater enthusiasm than in Australia.

F. M. CUTLACK.

PORTUGAL UNDER THE REPUBLIC

It is said of the Moors in Spain that, being compelled to baptize their children in the Christian faith, they would have the same infant baptized twenty times under twenty different names. The Government of Portugal, it is to be feared, resembles one of those unfortunate babies, for it changes its name but not its nature and, whether it is called an absolute or constitutional Monarchy, a Dictatorship, Democracy or Republic, remains a closely centralised organisation of certain personal groups, intriguing and legislating in the capital to the neglect or ruin of the provinces and of the Colonies. Certainly the latest change, from Monarchy to Republic, has hitherto involved no visible tendency to set Portuguese politics on a wider and saner basis. The indifference amid which the Monarchy struggled and tottered and fell has but deepened, the number of those by whom politics are avoided like pitch has only increased. Never before has the centralisation been more acute. The parliamentary elections were conducted in such a way as to misrepresent the people and represent a party. The nation had no voice in them: "the Parliament was constituted not by the vote of the nation but by the vote of the old Republican Party," says a leading Republican newspaper (the organ of the Evolutionists) so that it is "not a national Parliament but a Party assembly" (*A Republica*, October 3, 1912). The municipal elections have not been held at all, so that local affairs throughout Portugal are still presided over by men arbitrarily appointed by the Republican authorities at Lisbon. To quote the same newspaper, "the administrative dictatorship in which we are living" is diametrically opposed not only to the principles but to the true interests of the Republic (*A Republica*, October 25, 1912).

While the provinces are thus administered from Lisbon and

are sedulously refused an opportunity of showing the depth of their Republican enthusiasm, the Parliament in the Capital is so constituted that none of the four Parties, the Evolutionists, Unionists, Democrats and Independents, is strong enough to form a Ministry. Coalition Ministries are therefore the order of the day, consisting of secondary figures behind whom the Party leaders pull the strings. At the same time the Radical or Democrat element has a sufficient preponderance in the Parliament and in the Capital to impose its views on each nominally impartial Ministry, and to make it very unpleasant for a Government which does not adopt or wink at Democrat methods. Thus a moderate Government must either remain with crossed hands working out imaginary schemes of reform or resign as soon as its ideas of maintaining order collide with those of the extremists whose order is chaos. While Parliament is not sitting the former alternative is possible, and this accounts for the unusual duration, without even a reconstruction, of the Government of Senhor Duarte Leite, a man of great ability and distinction. But when Parliament meets the changes of Ministers and Ministries thicken. No Government since the beginning of the Republic has shown itself strong enough to repress the methods of the Democrats and the Carbonarios. At the magic cry "Defence of the Republic" every kind of abuse and persecution is permitted. The question asked by *A Republica* (November 4, 1912) with reference to the recent disorders at Oporto might be applied to the whole of Portugal, and urgently requires an answer: "Why does not the Government order an enquiry into the nature of the groups entitled 'for the Defence of the Republic,' and of their objects and methods? Since the Republic possesses the loyalty of the Army and the affection of Portuguese citizens, what need has it of these groups which have been and still are the real elements of social disorganisation at Oporto?" The real masters are the Carbonarios and the Democrats, acting behind the scenes and in secret societies; on the stage itself we have the successive Governments with their unimpeachable intentions and paper projects, but with their hands tied by (1) the extremists, (2) the state of the finances.

With respect to their finance the Republicans have two lines of defence in argument. They say (1) that the state of Portuguese

finances has improved since the advent of the Republic, (2) that the fact that it has not improved but rather steadily grown worse was but natural in a revolutionary period. The second is the more sincere defence, for it is undeniable that the Republic has been confronted by many extraordinary expenses—the defence of the Northern frontier, strikes and risings in Portugal, unrest in the Colonies, and lastly the bad wheat and maize crops of 1912 (after two good years). M. Edmond Théry, who recently visited Portugal, has shown in *L'Economiste Européen* that there is no need to despair of Portuguese finances if efficient and economical methods are adopted. But it is not evident that beyond an abstract desire for economy any real reforms have been effected. The payment of Members of Parliament, the sums disbursed to unofficial (Carbonario) supporters of the Republic, the remission of the *Consumos* taxes, the cost of maintaining the prisoners with which all the prisons have been crowded more than once since 1910, are instances of expenditure that was not unavoidable That a new foreign loan has not been contracted cannot be taken as a sign of prosperity. It is clear that negotiations for a loan have met with no encouragement abroad. A country with a debt of nearly 800,000 contos and a revenue of under 80,000 contos, and in which most of the sources of revenue are mortgaged to guarantee existing debts, cannot easily contract a new loan. It is suggested that it might be guaranteed by some of the revenues of the Portuguese colonies. But here it may be asked whether Portugal will not even now realise the greater expediency of selling some of her (African) colonies outright. The resolution not to part with an inch of territory may be less glorious than it sounds, and the same conventional idea of national honour prevented Spain from selling Cuba while it was yet time.

The expeditions of Vasco da Gama and others have given to Portugal a glory of which no passage of time nor shrinking of territory can rob her. But her treatment of the lands conquered has not been a glory, and may unhappily be summed up in two words: Extortion and Oppression, to the ruin alike of the colonies and of Portugal. The recent course of justice in Portugal and the news from the colonies, including such complacent telegrams as that from the Governor of Timor (August 1912) that "nearly 3000 natives had been killed and 4000 captured," makes one

wonder whether Portugal will ever learn to rule those under her absolute control. Her much-sung liberty appears to be as closely monopolised as her colonial products. Liberty no doubt precludes being oppressed but not oppressing, just as equality means for each person the levelling of the ranks above him, and of those only. A large outlay of capital on the Portuguese colonies would be remunerative, but the best way for Portugal to obtain this required capital would be to sell some of her colonies in order to exploit the others more profitably.

Meanwhile the floating debt has been increased in these two years by over 8000 contos (roughly £1,600,000), and the relation of the State to the *Banco de Portugal* has become more than ever one of "together we may stand but parted we fall." The deficit for the two years has been 11,820 contos, and there is very little prospect of the future deficits being less than about one-tenth of the entire revenue. It is, indeed, beginning to be very generally recognised that the Republic has made a bad situation worse, and that money continues to be squandered by the public departments. It is sufficient to quote a newspaper so fanatically Republican as *O Seculo*. The present condition of finances, it says (December 3, 1912) is "lamentable in every way: first, because much was made, and rightly so, of the waste of public money under the Monarchy; secondly, since the waste should have ceased, the strange increase in the expenditure is inexplicable; thirdly, because the expenditure has risen to such an extent that not only has it swallowed a not inconsiderable increase of revenue but has, moreover, caused a deficit larger than those of the last years of the Monarchy." "The men of the Republic," says the same newspaper (December 4, 1912), "are personally most honest, but as administrators of the public money they are not to be distinguished from what was bad in the administration under the Monarchy. Is this due to undignified concessions? To weakness or cowardice? We cannot say." The fiercest denunciations of an Opposition Press, were such permitted to exist now in Portugal, could scarcely be more damaging than this.

The only real constructive success under the Republic has been the development of the bureaucracy. In other respects progress has been confined to words. In public works little but promises could be expected in these first years. The improve-

ment in education is still to come, the schools remaining as miserable, the schoolmasters as ill-paid as ever. The people of Lisbon, upon whom the Republic mainly relies for support, are kept gazing at a multitude of projects, like the balls of a juggler, all in the air—new buildings or railways, a new navy, a bridge across the Tagus at Lisbon, a fleet of aeroplanes, and so forth—while its pocket is being picked. For the price of nearly everything has increased since the Revolution, gone up and stayed up. For instance, one of the first measures of the Republic was to abolish with a flourish of generosity the *Consumos* tax paid by the people on certain articles of food entering Lisbon from the country. The price of these articles (*e.g.* pork and olive-oil) fell, fluctuated, rose, surpassed the former price, and two years later, by a crowning touch of absurdity, the Government felt itself obliged to reimpose (October 1912) a tax of a halfpenny per *kilo* of pork and per *litre* of olive-oil. The State has lost, the people are paying more, and it is not by such amateur devices that the budgets can be made to show smaller deficits than under the Monarchy. In other respects the tradesmen of Lisbon have suffered the natural effects of a revolution, and after two years the effects continue, since many well-to-do people are disinclined to return to Lisbon when they see politics maintained at an acute stage and the continued persecution of persons suspected of being Royalist, even though they are completely withdrawn from public affairs.

In the provinces the patient, hard-working peasant—whom the statistician dismisses as illiterate, but who is really the Portuguese of old, unspoiled by civilisation—would seem to have little to expect from the Republic. The worker who wishes to be let alone to earn his living has little good to say of the new régime. It is said significantly of a peasant that, when asked in confidence why he was shouting for Affonso Costa (the Portuguese Lloyd George) and the Democrats, he answered that by showing himself in favour of the Democrats he stood in no fear of molestation, whereas if he belonged to any other party or to no party at all he could not tell how soon he might not find himself within the walls of a prison as a conspirator. It is also significant that emigration has increased by leaps and bounds. The official figure for 1909, published in 1912, was 30,288 emigrants. Possibly some 20,000

more escaped registration. For 1912, the actual figure is estimated by a Republican newspaper, the *Diario de Noticias*, at 80,000 or even 90,000 (out of a total population of 6,000,000).

Thus, apparently, the peasants look with scepticism upon the Republican promises. Except, indeed, on paper the work of the Republicans so far has been purely destructive. They boast that in the space of eleven months the Provisional Government by its legislation bridged the gap of fifty years that separated the condition of Portugal from that of other modern peoples. This claim is its own condemnation, and indeed this orgy of legislation really resembled a game of ducks and drakes far more than building with stones and mortar. The new laws that have been enforced are essentially destructive, as that of the separation between Church and State, an insidious blow aimed at the very existence of religion in Portugal. Similarly almost every *viva* uttered since 1910 may be interpreted to mean "Down with this or that." And this is only natural in a revolutionary period. Now, however, the critical time for the Republic has arrived, the time in which to show that it can construct as well as pull down. No immediate enemy threatens, the opponents of the Republic have stood aside, as it were, to give the Republic a fair chance to prove its worth; Spain has met the Republic more than half way in measures to prevent further attacks on the part of the Portuguese refugees; the attitude of the Church has been extremely moderate under provocation. But, since the last menace of a Royalist invasion died away in July, the Republic has lost rather than gained in prestige. The Royalist prisoners have been treated as vile criminals and traitors. These are the terms generally applied to them in the Portuguese Press, and even Senhor Arriaga, the benevolent President of the Republic, upon the occasion of the second anniversary celebrations (October 1912) referred to the "awful crimes—*crimes nefandos*" of the prisoners, many of whom had been accused and condemned on the scantiest evidence. The sentence of the courts-martial in a large number of cases has been six years of cellular imprisonment followed by ten of deportation, or as an alternative twenty years of deportation (the prisoners are not, however, given the choice): *i.e.* political prisoners are condemned to the food and dress of convicts, to have their heads shaved and to suffer other indignities. The various courts-martial have found the

prisoners guilty with monotonous regularity. Their verdicts appear to have been quite indiscriminating, and to have had very little to do with the evidence before them. The same heavy sentence was passed upon Dom João d'Almeida, one of the Royalist leaders, upon peasants who scarcely knew the difference between a Monarchy and a Republic, and (the first case tried by the Lisbon court-martial) upon five young men of good family who were suspected of conspiring because they met together in a deserted farmhouse and were reported to have said that King Manoel would return. Against another man condemned by the Lisbon court-martial there was some difficulty in proving even that he had been suspected.

If these are the guilty, it becomes fairly evident on what fragile pretexts those who had been arrested are released as innocent with or without a trial. In the case of Miss Oram, a British subject, it required but four days to quash in ridicule the reasons alleged for her arrest; but the unfortunate ladies—such as Dona Constança Telles de Gama, daughter of the Conde de Cascaes, and a descendant of Vasco da Gama—who cannot rely upon the British Minister to see that justice is done, are kept for weeks and months in prison. The result is that justice is no longer respected or expected. Bacon said that "When any of the four pillars of government are mainly shaken or weakened (which are religion, justice, counsel and treasure) men had need to pray for fair weather." He did not say what should be done when all four pillars have been weakened. It is amazing that the Governments of the Republic, admitting the deplorable condition of the prisons, should have allowed them to be filled and filled with political prisoners, many of them acknowledged to be innocent. When the prisons were crowded on a former occasion, the Premier, Senhor Chagas, declared that a large proportion of them were innocent, and the same admission was virtually made when the present War Minister issued an edict declaring that, in view of the large number of ungrounded arrests, false accusers would be severely dealt with. This was not done, however, till the prisons had been filled with alleged conspirators, denounced for the most part by private persons. There was in fact a deliberate manufacture of conspirators on the part of the Carbonarios who may be called private persons in that they

escape all responsibility, but who, receiving money from the authorities, are anxious to justify their salaries and at the same time to parade their zeal for the Republic by discovering conspiracies where no conspiracies were.

One of the worst features of this petty imitation reign of terror has been the silence or the open approval of the Press. The extraordinarily unfair verdicts of the Lisbon court-martial have been received without a protest; at the murder of Lieutenant Soares by Carbonarios, a murder which deserved to ring through Europe as did the death of Ferrer, no protest was raised, nor was any attempt made to bring the perpetrators to justice—indeed, the Democratic Press a few days later was approving or encouraging attacks on defenceless Royalists in the streets of Lisbon. Again, Senhor Affonso Costa, during the second anniversary celebrations, made a speech (October 3, 1912) at the graves of Buiça and Costa, the assassins of King Carlos and the Crown Prince. As reported in the moderate and impartial *Diario de Noticias*, he said, "It is only those who do not love Portugal who do not pay homage to these two men, who in a few moments performed an admirable and honourable work. . . . Honour then to their memory." Senhor Costa is perfectly free to entertain and express these opinions, but once more the significant point is that what appears to be deliberate incitement to murder one's political opponents, and the acceptance on the part of the Republicans of full responsibility for the crimes of February 1, 1908, should have been chronicled by the Press without a protest. The Press is in fact muzzled and terrorised, and the newspapers which do protest—gradually disappear. Instances have been *O Liberal*, *O Correio da Manhã*, *O Diario Illustrado* (the offices of these newspapers were wrecked by the mob—the mob organised by the extremists—in January 1911) and, more recently *O Jornal de Noticias*, *O Diario do Porto* at Oporto and *O Dia* at Lisbon, besides less prominent provincial journals.

Is it to be wondered at if "to the sympathy with which the victory of October 5 was received has succeeded a terrible isolation, a dreadful coldness?" (*A Republica*, September 14, 1912).

It is a little difficult to sympathise with the Republicans who complain of suffering in their turn from that indifference of which they took advantage in order to overthrow the Monarchy, under

the false pretence that they were doing so in the name of the people. To the fact that the Republicans are conscious of having intrigued as a political clan in the name of the nation may, indeed, be attributed their tendency to panic and their vindictive treatment of the Royalists. At the same time the indifference of which moderate Republicans now complain is fatal, for once more it enables a comparatively small band of extremists to palm off their doctrines, *e.g.* Anti-Clericalism, as though they had the approval of the nation, and thus "a few that are stiff do tire out a great number that are more moderate."

Many sincere Republicans must now realise that it was a mistake not to work at reform from within the Monarchy, and that it would have been easier to engraft the advantages of a Republic on the Monarchy than it will be to engraft the advantages of the Monarchy on the Republic. The mistake has been paid for by two years of disquiet. M. Léon Poinsard's was an obvious and reasonable prophecy when he wrote in his *Le Portugal Inconnu* (*La Science Sociale*, Oct. and Nov. 1910):

> Si on prétend mettre la charrue avant les bœufs, et reconstituer la situation politique avant celle de la vie privée et des institutions locales, si on prétend lutter contre les abus et les bassesses de la politique par la politique elle-même, l'échec est inévitable. Encore une fois jamais, dans cette arène, les hommes droits et probes, naturellement soucieux de leur réputation, ne pourront prévaloir contre les intrigants et les ambitieux qui font métier de la politique. Toujours les premiers seront roulés et écartés par les seconds, dont l'audace n'est contenue par aucune borne. On verra échouer successivement toutes les tentatives futures comme ont échoué toutes les expériences du passé. Les ministres honnêtes, combattus dans l'ombre, joués, trahis, dénoncés, menacés, se retireront les uns après les autres, découragés, écœurés, indignés par les procédés, les exigences, les appétits dont ils sont assiégés.

Hitherto, unfortunately, the Republic has been the apotheosis of politics, at the expense of administration. It is, of course, easy and sweet, as Lucretius knew, for those on shore to criticise those who are being tossed on the great sea of politics; and no doubt a better and more fruitful attitude will exist if the opponents of the Republic agree during the next few years to criticise it as little as possible and to throw no obstacles in its path. There would, however, necessarily be certain conditions to this tacit understanding, and foremost among them: that a general amnesty for political prisoners should be proclaimed; that no

fresh prosecutions on the score of political or religious opinions should occur; that the Government should do its utmost to discourage and disavow, if it is powerless to disband, the Carbonaria and all secret societies; and fourthly, that municipal and new parliamentary elections should be held as soon as possible, and conducted fairly, without official coercion.

Some fifteen hundred years before Portugal became a kingdom Aristophanes asked the question: ῷ δημοκρτία, πõι προβιβᾷς ἡμᾶς ποτε;—O democracy, whither are you leading us? "To lawlessness and anarchy" seems to be the present answer of Portugal; unless, indeed, the more moderate men, represented by Senhor Antonio José d'Almeida and the Evolutionist Party, can be induced to come forward from their retirement and make it clear that they, and not the clumsy imitators of French Jacobinism, are in a majority. But so long as the Republic remains as it were a Lisbon monopoly, and so long as the Government is composed of men who, however excellent their intentions, have not the real control of affairs, and are unable to prevent persecutions and outrages of which they most certainly disapprove, there is no hope that either Portugal or the Republic will prosper.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

THE RAVEN

As a breeding bird the raven has long been exterminated in this county—Shropshire—but in the spring of 1910 a pair were seen for a month or two in the very valley among the Church Stretton hills where ravens used to nest in bygone times. This may only have been a coincidence, but it was at least a very curious one. The attachment of ravens to some particular locality has been only too well tested in other districts, where the unfortunate birds have endeavoured year after year to make their nest, only to be robbed, if not shot at. In several cases, where one of the pair was killed the other disappeared, to return shortly with a fresh mate—this went on until both were destroyed. The distance covered by the birds when on such journeys must have been enormous, though when one considers their great stretch of wing it is not so incredible. It also seems strange that the surviving bird could so readily find a mate, but no doubt there are a certain number of unattached ones about—bachelors or spinsters as the case may be—who would readily accept an eligible match in the shape of a raven who is the owner of a really nice nesting-place.

In defence of their home, a pair of ravens are very bold, and some time ago there appeared in one of the weekly papers an account of two attacking and driving off a golden eagle. It was on one of the Scotch deer forests, and the ravens had their home on a hill-side, but when a great eagle came sailing lazily past—it seemed from the description that the bigger bird had just had a heavy meal—they did not hesitate to fly at the "monarch of the air," whom they worried so much that he hurried off, nor did the smaller birds desist until they had driven him quite away, when they returned with croaks of triumph.

The voice of the raven cannot be called musical, and many superstitions are founded on its croak. In the nursery rhyme the farmer's mare did not tumble down until the raven croaked, and it is said to be extraordinarily unlucky to hear one; however, I had always desired to know what the sound was like, and when offered a couple of young birds as pets I accepted with delight, thoughts of the wonderful raven that Dickens wrote of in *Barnaby Rudge* floating through my mind as I did so. The two young ravens arrived by an evening train at our little country station. I was not there to meet them myself, but the boy who was sent to fetch them told me all about it.

"I sees the guard put a big basket out on the platform, and then that there station-master went to pick it up, but the birds inside gave sich a caw, an' didn't he just jump, Miss! An' he says to me, 'call 'em birds, they sounds more like an engine letting off steam!'"

Such was the account the boy gave me as we stooped over the basket, cutting knots in string and endeavouring to release the captives. At last we had the cover off, and a great black bird flopped out almost into the lad's face and away round the room. The youth gave a frightened yell and almost tumbled backwards, but, crying to him to hold number two, I soon caught the first, and then we took them to their cage, which was a fair-sized building of wire-netting.

Bearing in mind the traditional character of these birds I suggested calling them Satan and the Evil One, but the names did not meet with public approval, and Ben and Joe was what they were eventually named. At first the latter names really seemed the more appropriate, for two more quiet, timid, or well-behaved creatures one could not have wished to meet with. They never uttered a sound except when frightened, which was not seldom, for considering they had been bred in captivity, they were far from tame. Nor did they seem to appreciate my efforts to hand-feed them—they had only just left the nest and could not yet feed themselves—which had this advantage, they very quickly learnt to pick up little bits of meat for themselves. However, I saw that in this way I should never get them really tame, so went and consulted our cook—to have an ally in the cook is a very useful thing where animals and birds are con-

earned—who soon agreed to take the ravens under her special care if I clipped their wings and placed them in the walled-in yard that the kitchen doors opened into. Here they would have the benefit of plenty of society, to say nothing of good things to eat, such as scraps that the cook might happen to have at her disposal. For the first few days no one would have known the birds were in the yard, save for a notice affixed to the door, "Please Shut this Door, because of the Ravens," but at the end of a week they left their retreat in the coal-hole and began to explore; at the end of two weeks they had invaded the kitchen, and at the end of three they had lost all fear, and become, as their friend the cook expressed it, "as bold as brass, if not a good bit worse!"

Soon they could only be kept out of the house by always shutting the doors, and gradually the mild, meek, innocent birds began to develop very decided characters not at all in keeping with such commonplace names as Ben and Joe—the cook was heard to say, "Devils, devils! They're worse than devils!" Indeed they had become the veriest imps of mischief. As an example, though provided with a tin of water in which to bathe—which they did daily—when they found a basin in the back kitchen, with a large cabbage laid inside it, these two birds pulled the vegetable out on to the sink, and thence on to the floor; after which they got into the pan and proceeded to splash the water over their shiny black feathers, and incidentally far and wide over the floor, but when they heard footsteps it did not take them a second to jump out, off the sink, through the door, and hop away to their refuge the coal-hole, where they croaked loudly to each other.

They were, and are—for I have them at the moment of writing and can hear their voices raised in protest on some subject or other—very fond of washing, hardly ever missing a daily tub, and always taking it together. For instance, Joe, after hesitating on the verge of the cold water for some seconds, steps hesitatingly in and splashes a few drops over his shoulders; whereupon Ben comes hopping up, gives Joe a poke, makes him get out—which he does with ruffled feathers, making strange sounds in his throat—and gets in instead. Joe will not wait long. Soon he turns Ben out, gets in again and has a further splash about. And so they

go on; first one and then the other being in the pan, until both are as wet "as a drowned rat," and the water is black with coal-dust washed from their plumage. When at last they are satisfied that it is impossible to get any damper they retire to the topmost lump of coal in the "coal-hole," and dry and preen their feathers.

It is among the coal that they hide their bigger treasures, for they are great at secreting things, but small objects are placed carefully in holes that they have drilled in the soft sandstone of one of the yard walls. It is astonishing what holes they have dug out with their strong beaks between the blocks of stone, and in one or two spots into the rock itself. Here they bring any small pieces of food they have over, push it into one of the holes, tucking any stray bit in with the greatest care, and finally ram in two or three ivy leaves or a few bits of straw so that nothing shall be visible. Uneatable things that happen to take their fancy are treated in the same manner, and I have seen Joe stow away a brightly coloured marble, the stump of a yellow pencil, and a bit of rag, one after the other, but never forgetting to hide them with leaves, which precaution is very necessary as they love to steal from one another—an extra loud cry generally meaning that the owner of some special treasure has caught his brother carrying it off and is pursuing him round and round the yard.

They usually settle their differences without much loss of time; indeed, there appears to be the greatest affection between the two birds, and one may frequently see them caressing each other with their great strong bills in the gentlest and most loving manner. Should they lose sight of one another their anxiety is intense; but they are seldom apart, for whatever the one does so does number two! They always combine their efforts, whether bent on mischief or defence against a common foe; for instance, should one of the cats appear in the kitchen doorway, perhaps venturing a few steps into the yard, they will at once cease the tug-of-war that they were having with a small stick, and after glancing at each other with shining grey eyes (their eyes are the least black part of them) proceed to the attack.

Puss has perhaps come a few paces out into the yard and sat down to lick her paws and wash her face, though keeping a

cautious eye on one of the ravens who peeps at her from behind the pump. While Ben engages her attention in this fashion, Joe is stealthily creeping up behind her; a step at a time, one by one he comes, walking sideways like a crab, and looking the personification of wickedness. At last he is within reach of her tail, which is stretched out on the pavement, and which she gives an occasional twitch to as she keeps a doubtful eye on Ben. Joe pauses, then takes one more hesitating step, and very gingerly another—suddenly he leans forward and tweaks the tip of that twitching tail! With a frantic mew the cat springs round, but Joe is already halfway across the yard, and her other foe hopping out from the shelter of the pump gives her another pinch from that side! So it goes on, whichever way the cat turns there is a bird ready to pull her tail, and at last poor puss beats a hasty retreat, spitting furiously, and with all her dignity upset; indeed, it takes quite half an hour's licking and cleaning before she feels that she is presentable again.

The feud began through the cats stealing the birds' foods, but they seldom venture to do so now.

Nominally the ravens are fed on rabbit flesh, but all sorts of other things are included in their diet, for there is very little they will not eat when they think it is stolen. They carry off from the kitchen almost everything they can lay their bills upon: raw potatoes, green peas, butter, bread, cheese, meat—either cooked or raw—dog biscuit; indeed, all comes alike, even uneatable things, such as spoons being carried off and hidden among the coal. Butter is perhaps the greatest treat that can be offered them, and they will take it off one's fingers with the uttermost gentleness, not even giving the smallest pinch by mistake. Next to butter in their estimation comes cheese, and they will even fly up on to my knees when I am sitting down to get a piece if I have some in my hands.

The way the ravens catch is quite extraordinary. I have never seen a dog to equal them; they do not open their bills, but just nip up anything that is flung to them. I have seen my brother take a handful of peas and throw them one by one to Ben; the bird never missed a catch unless the pea was very badly thrown, and, as he did not want to eat all that were given him, he held them in his beak until the pouch in his lower jaw was

nearly bursting, and yet he went on catching! At last he took his beakful of treasures and hid them in one of the holes in the wall.

The staple food of these birds is, as I said before, rabbit, but they also have rats, mice, and birds when any chance to be killed, though on one or two occasions they have done the killing for themselves. One day an innocent little duckling found its way into the raven's dominion, but Joe quickly captured it, carried it off to the coal-hole, and before it could be rescued he had stilled its squeaks for ever, nor did it take the two of them long to dispose of the body!

When eating a rabbit the ravens generally pull out and swallow its eyes, for eyes they evidently consider a special tit-bit; indeed, they often have quite angry disputes as to which shall have them, but it is Ben who generally secures them. Ben, though slightly the smaller of the two birds, is certainly master—or can it be mistress? This raven is always referred to as "he" but I have grave doubts whether "she" would not be more correct; however the name Ben generally settles which pronoun shall be used, yet I strongly suspect that when poor Joe gets so "bullied," he is literally being well hen-pecked.

Excepting the very slightest difference in size, and that perhaps Joe has a trifle the broader head, they are exactly alike, and it requires a good acquaintance with them before one can tell them apart; though as a matter of fact, however alike they may be in the matter of glossy black plumage, in character they are quite different. Ben is a more cautious bird than Joe, while the latter though so bold with friends is certainly the more timid when strangers are about. Indeed both birds dislike people, cats or dogs they are not acquainted with, and, when any person they do not know appears, they promptly retire into their stronghold, the coal-hole, whence they survey the new comer in safety.

I am very anxious to allow them their liberty, for I do not think as long as their wings are kept partly clipped that they will attempt to go away from the place that they now look upon as home, but other people will not hear of it: they recount the deaths of those young ducklings that rashly came into the yard, and point to the way both ravens rush to the door whenever they hear a duck quack or a chicken squeak, and turning

their heads upside down gaze with longing eyes through the tiny crack at the bottom! No, indeed it would never do to allow such wicked birds their liberty I am told. And it must be admitted that they probably would do a good deal of damage by eating eggs, and perhaps young chickens, for, apart from what one knows they can do in this way, the very shape—slightly curved—of their great strong beaks shows that naturally they are flesheaters more than vegetarians. As I have said before, both Ben and Joe will eat green peas and potatoes, but not with any great relish, nor does fruit seem to appeal to them very much. Ben will not touch it, though Joe does not mind strawberries and gooseberries. In a wild state a raven's diet must be very varied, even more so than any other member of that omnivorous genus the crows. No description of carrion comes amiss, from a dead sheep to fish, while even insects are accepted thankfully. One observer found in examining the castings that had been thrown up by a raven—these birds have the power of rejecting the indigestible portion of their food in the same manner that owls and hawks do—that they were mainly composed of the cocoons of the Oak Egger moth: evidently the raven had enjoyed a good meal of the pupæ which it had found in their cocoons on some low-growing shrubs.

Notwithstanding that this bird may sometimes be useful by destroying such insects, in general it is far from being a blessing, and the reason it is so rapidly becoming scarce in Great Britain is not far to seek, for where game preserving is much indulged in it could never be tolerated, though perhaps one may say this much for it, that as a scavenger it has its uses.

Talking, or rather writing, of it as a scavenger, reminds me of what was said before concerning the bad character given it by people of a superstitious mind, and the reason why becomes much more apparent when one is intimately associated with a pair of the birds. Given sufficient credulity it would not be difficult to imagine that these bright-eyed, quick-moving, impudent creatures were evil spirits in birds' plumage. Apart from the glossiness of their black feathers, black legs and bill (which is even black inside, the dark hue extending to the tongue and throat), they are so intensely black that "black as a raven's wing" has passed into a proverb, while this sombre hue to ignorant

minds seems a further indication that they are in league with the Evil One. Probably its real use is to give warning to any more powerful bird that they are not worth attacking, their flesh being too bitter to eat. It is noteworthy that all our English crows are conspicuously coloured, and none of the flesh-eating creatures care for their meat, for it is very bitter in every case. However, this view of the matter does not occur to the average countryman, and he sticks to the old tales, except in those districts where ravens have been so long exterminated that their memory has even gone from old stories and legends, in which the magpie has had to be inserted as the hero in place of the larger bird.

If the raven has a wicked look when on the alert there is also something almost awe-inspiring about it when at rest, or when merely quietly waiting for an opportunity to accomplish some deed.

To show the hold this bird had on the imaginations of our forefathers it may be mentioned that in ancient days, when hunting the deer was an exact science and the disposing of the slaughtered stag a most solemn matter, a certain portion was always allotted to it.

> . . . . . raven on the blasted oak,
> That, watching while the deer is broke,
> His morsel claims with sullen croak ?

wrote Sir Walter Scott, in allusion to this custom, and in reference to the uncanny way the raven has of making an appearance whenever there is any dead thing it can take its share of.

To sum up the character of our friend the raven, one may say that though many highly imaginative tales have been told of it, and it has at times been sadly maligned, yet it is one of the cleverest and most interesting of our English birds, though perhaps somewhat mischievous where game is concerned, but for all that worth protection, if only to prevent it being altogether exterminated, and that we will hope is yet far far away, for we could ill-afford to lose the hero of so much folk-lore.

FRANCES PITT

A RADICAL "PANAMA"?

We have the high authority of an esteemed contemporary, the *Daily Chronicle*, for the striking statement that "the Postmaster-General is always master of his tasks." Not sometimes, not generally, but "always." We further learn on the same unimpeachable authority (*vide* the *Daily Chronicle*, January 20, 1913) that "in all-round efficiency he has few equals and no superior in the Cabinet." This is not *Punch*, mind you, but the *Daily Chronicle*, whose sense of humour is almost as limited as that of the *Daily News and Leader*—two brilliant constellations which an unappreciative world has constrained to become one.

I hope that the readers of the *National Review* will not be prejudiced by the fact that this tribute comes from a Radical newspaper. It is worthy of reflection, because, as some people may not be aware, the Postmaster-General happens to be none other than Mr. Herbert Samuel, whose name is on everybody's lips just now, not so much as the personification of all-round efficiency but as the responsible author of the notorious Marconi Agreement, which grows fine by degrees and beautifully less at the time of writing. If Mr. Herbert Samuel has no superior in efficiency among his colleagues—for which Unionists should gladly take the word of such an unprejudiced and instructed observer as the *Daily Chronicle*—what in the name of all that is conceivable must the others be like? Hitherto the Postmaster-General and the Post Office had enjoyed the advantage of being wrapped in mystery, but we now know something about the Minister and a good deal about the administration upon which the searchlight of a reluctant Select Committee of the House of Commons—consisting of a decided preponderance of Mr. Samuel's political supporters—has been cast, and the raising of the veil has revealed a degree of ineptitude—to use the mildest possible

word—unmatched in the history of British bureaucracy, and probably hard to beat in the records of other bureaucracies, of whom our Post Office finds itself the cynosure of admiring and envious eyes.

The prim self-sufficiency of the present Postmaster-General —why General we have never been able to make out, why not Admiral?—his smug official manner and arrogant speeches, have completely deceived a House of Commons which only asked to be deceived, though Bismarck, who was quite as great a man as our Postmaster-General, declared it was easier—and he spoke from some experience, to deceive a Sovereign than a Parliament. But when Mr. Samuel comes out into the open and shows us the manner of man he is and the secrets of the prison-house are disclosed by the luckless officials placed in the invidious and unaccustomed position of having to explain what they have never understood, the vaunted "efficiency" of the most efficient member of the most efficient Ministry the world has yet seen would appear to be at about the level of the efficiency of the Village Idiot. Certainly no village idiot could have made a more hideous mess of any business from whatever standpoint you look at it than our Heaven-born Postmaster-General has made of one of the simplest problems ever presented to a public department, which to-day finds itself dragged in the mire and exposed to the public gaze as an object of derision. If the Post Office has been reduced to the parlous plight—indicated by the officials who have testified before the Marconi Select Committee—by the most efficient member of the Cabinet, what must be the state of other departments under the auspices of less efficient administrators? We know to what a pass "clear thinking" has brought the Territorial Force without any Select Committee. We can guess at the chaos raging at the Admiralty, thanks to a brazen Wind-bag who has failed in everything except "nobbling" the Press. We see Insurance Day celebrated by champagne-cum-cocoa at the National Liberal Club, silver goblets to ill-starred infants, the decoration of the happy house in Manchester where "our Mr. Lloyd George" first saw the light fifty years ago, followed by the funerals of the unfortunate victims of a reckless, feckless demagogue. We see a general orgy of snobbery, jobbery and robbery, flagrant, palpable, odious.

In spite of the conspiracy of silence on the part of many newspapers—and in this conspiracy Ministers can always rely on the assistance of a considerable section of so-called "Unionist" newspapers, which divide their energies between helping the Government out of successive holes and putting what is fondly imagined to be "their own side," so to speak, "in the cart"—the public, which has not yet been completely debauched by the Americanisation of the London press rapidly spreading to the provinces, is becoming uneasy, restive, suspicious, as to the honour of our public men. Indeed, the word "honour" is becoming a mockery in the back-scratching trade of politics.

Although amazing efforts have been made, are being made, and doubtless will continue to be made, to hush up the sinister scandals which are cropping up in every direction like mushrooms over night, truth, like murder, will occasionally out. Amid many saddening features in current politics there is an occasional bright spot. Recent events have taught us that, in spite of the pressure of the Coalition Caucus, the impudent effrontery of the Coalition press, and the huge resources of the Radical Plutocracy, which has feet in all political parties, and can buy up a newspaper as easily as an ordinary man can buy an umbrella (without any intimation to the readers of that newspaper that its proprietary has changed)—there is still sufficient public opinion manifesting itself in divers ways and unexpected places to insist that portions of the Augean stables shall occasionally be cleansed.

Besides providing us with a Costa Rica Constitution under the Parliament Act, the Asquith Ministry are gradually introducing Costa Rica government, and already we hear that expressive Transatlantic phrase, "—— is not in politics for his health." Brazil is beginning to look down upon British politicians, while Guatemala has ceased to look up to them. If any one is satisfied with the silver scandals in which the India Office has become enmeshed and the manner in which they have been dealt with by Ministers, one may admire his optimism without being infected by it. Moreover, although Mr. Gladstone was a keen party man, whose geese were all swans, while his exercise of patronage placed many geese in positions properly belonging to swans, it is permissible to doubt whether he would have

approved of Mr. Asquith's conduct in this case. Mr. Gladstone counts for nothing nowadays with his fickle followers, but he is likely to be remembered long after his forensic successor has been forgotten, not so much for what he did, as he achieved little and that little was bad for the country and left a legacy of bitterness and hatred, but owing to his serious efforts to maintain the dignity of public life even when he was selling his party to Parnell. One can hardly imagine the Grand Old Man being content to be a cipher in a government of Isaacses, Samuels, and Montagus. He would have enquired why the purchase of silver immemorially confided to the Bank of England had been removed elsewhere, and if good cause could be shown he would have insisted, if only for the sake of appearance, that such an enormously profitable transaction should be transferred anywhere than to the House of Samuel and Montagu, even though the Government might have to pay a somewhat higher price than could be secured by these astute brokers. Though a Cobdenite of Cobdenites and a cosmopolitan among cosmopolitans, Mr. Gladstone recognised that cheapness was not everything and that mere cheapness might cost very dear. Mr. Harold Baker, the locum tenens of the India Office in the House of Commons during the gratuitous, fortuitous, and strangely prolonged absence of a member of the great Montagu clan in India, probably shares Mr. Gladstone's view. To spend one's days and nights in Parliament in the position of a fly on a pin must be anything but exhilarating to an aspiring politician.

The Colonial Office which has long since lost every vestige of the prestige it enjoyed in the great days when "there was a man in Downing Street" is another department which would probably be all the better for investigation. No one would for a moment suggest that the Colonial Secretary—whatever one may think of his politics—is capable of entering upon a corrupt transaction, the thing is absurd. But he has been particularly busy of late in digging up his colleagues' grotesque utterances on Woman Suffrage with a view to making the speech of his life. There may have been some relaxation of vigilance in Downing Street. A bureaucracy living under a Radical harrow is liable to become sensitive to the powerful backstairs influences of the Radical plutocracy, who in return for "party services" of an unspecified and possibly unspecifiable character—for which,

by the way, they are abundantly repaid in the shape of Honours—anticipate lucrative concessions and monopolies when their friends are in office. If there be no hanky-panky contemplated as regards Sarawak, which is understood to contain material though undeveloped resources beyond the dreams of avarice, and about which strange rumours are bruited abroad—there are curious developments in West Africa which we cannot help feeling that the Cocoa Press and the "wild men" of the Coalition would be vociferously denouncing from every house-top if their opponents were in power, unless of course they largely depended for their subsistence on soap advertisements, which apparently prevent even Unionist papers from being as watchful as they should be.

Upon the subject of Honours, some of which are rooted in "dishonour," enough has been said for the moment, and something substantial has been effected by the Radical Plutocracy Enquiry which has opportunely reminded the world that what is sauce for the Tory goose is equally sauce for the Radical gander. There would appear to be a momentary lull in the avalanche of bounding barons, blatant baronets, and dubious privy councillors, while even our congested Orders of Chivalry are enjoying a brief respite from the inroads of the National Liberal Club.

But as against this item on the credit side of the account, an oil scandal of alarming dimensions is looming on the horizon. It threatens the very security of the State. Great Britain enjoys a monopoly of, or at any rate a supremacy in, the finest steam coal in the world, which is the basis of our Sea-power. If common sense had any voice in our councils, the British Admiralty would long since have acquired possession of such coal-fields as a national reserve for the exclusive use of the British Navy and allied navies, and the Germans would have to whistle elsewhere for steam coal. There is comparatively little oil in these islands, and it is obviously to British interests, including of course Imperial interests, that so long as possible the command of the Sea should rest upon coal. It is certainly not our interest to force the pace of oil competition, any more than it is our interest to try and retard the development of flight. Unfortunately, however, an omnipotent Radical plutocracy, many of whom are alien in every sense of that term and would view with fortitude a disaster to the British Navy or even the invasion of these islands by their

German cousins, provided they saw their way to making money out of such transactions, are probably involved in the oil trade. Moreover, attractive billets are being created for Radical politicians and their belongings.

The Universal Provider of the party, Lord Cowdray, still remembered as Sir Weetman Pearson, may be the best patriot in the country, but his material interests might conceivably clash with national interests, as is not infrequently the case under our Cobdenite system, and no man should be allowed to become a dictator of policy in the event of such clash of interests. Just as there is nothing like leather, and as we were told the other day there was nothing like Marconi, so we are liable at any moment to learn from Coalition organs of light and leading that there is nothing like oil—that coal is obsolete, and that the time has come for "a courageous stroke of the pen" (to borrow the historic phrase by which a distinguished Prime Minister described the "scrapping" of British ships by our only sailor-politician), to convert the coal bunkers of the British Fleet into oil tanks. There are powerful forces behind this movement and there is the usual boom in oil shares, and we all know to our daily discomfort to what a pass the price of petrol has brought the metropolis. We should of course be told that "the Admiralty" is convinced of the imperious necessity of panic-stricken measures to promote the oil boom, and conceivably the Report of a Royal Commission, presided over by Sir John Fisher—created a peer for his stupendous services to the Navy and the Nation—might be enlisted in the sacred cause. Let us keep calm amid the clamour of a cheap sensational press, and the inevitable excitement which would doubtless be enhanced by the Stock Exchange gamble which is an occasional concomitant of Ministerial transactions.

What after all is "the Admiralty" that we should bow down before its pontifical decrees? Only the other day "the Admiralty" consisted of "Sleep quietly in your beds." His word was law to most of the newspapers and nearly all the politicians. Mr. McKenna was his prophet and he had his jackals in both parties. Then all of a sudden there was a slump in Fisherism, which had brought the British Navy to a state of unrest perilous to contemplate, and the German navy in sight of naval supremacy. In the twinkling of an eye the "sailor-politician" disappeared from the

scene of his glory in Whitehall and the great silent sailer, Admiral Wilson, one of the finest seamen who ever trod a quarter-deck, found himself installed as "the Admiralty" and summarily summoned to make bricks without straw at a crisis unforeseen by the British Government, though it had been anticipated by every intelligent onlooker. "The Admiralty" had become an affair of tons and guns without an adequacy of either, and the Mandarins of both parties had resolutely resisted every attempt to provide it with a strategic department which should work out in peace the problem of war. When the Anglo-German crisis broke in 1911, it speedily transpired that, in spite of that ingenious device to bamboozle the public known as the Defence Committee, "the Admiralty," any Admiralty, and the War Office were not on speaking terms. The War Office had not the dimmest conception of "the Admiralty's" plan of campaign for the simple reason that there was none, while "the Admiralty" was not aware of the existence of the War Office and had forgotten the history of that important epoch between Trafalgar and Waterloo. In spite of the bombast of "Sleep quietly in your beds," "the Admiralty" was not even prepared to guarantee the security of the Straits of Dover, though in season and out of season Minister after Minister had been allowed to proclaim *urbi et orbi* that our command of the Seas was unchallenged and unchallengeable.

With our public men, the word nearly always takes the place of the deed, and "hôt air" is regarded by Wind-bags as an adequate substitute for every naval deficiency. Admiral Wilson was the scapegoat of Fisherism, and Mr. Winston Churchill, who was perhaps more responsible than any other demagogue—with the exception of the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer—for the perilous position into which we had drifted, seized the opportunity to pitchfork Mr. McKenna and his entire Board out of "the Admiralty" and to instal himself in their places with Sir Francis Bridgeman, Prince Louis of Battenberg and others, who forthwith became "the Admiralty," and the fetish. This perpetual game of post played by interested politicians has tended to rob constituted authority of the prestige which in the great days of Sir Frederic Richards properly appertained to the Admiralty, for it is impossible to concede that each Board is omniscient and infallible during its brief existence, and that the totally different Board which succeeds

it enjoys the same attributes in pursuing a [illegible] policy. Sir Francis Bridgeman, the First Sea Lord, as might have been expected, has been insolently ejected from "the Admiralty" because he was not sufficiently servile to the Wind-bag of Dundee, who regards any unfortunate department over which he may momentarily preside as a doormat on which to wipe his boots. It is the lot of departments, like minorities, in the Birrell creed, to submit and suffer under the mountebanks who oppress them, and there is a good deal of hard official swearing that black is white and white is black. But there are limits to human endurance. Sir Francis Bridgeman was not born to be a doormat, and however inevitable his retirement, it has caused profound dismay to all who have the interests of the Navy at heart, which would not have been alleviated had the whole truth been known. Prince Louis of Battenberg now reigns in his stead. He is an able and gallant sailor with a high reputation as a tactician, but he has the profound misfortune to be the brother-in-law of Prince Henry of Prussia, the most bitter Anglophobe among all the Hohenzollerns, which is saying a great deal. Prince Henry thinks by day and dreams by night of the "great day" when in command of the great German navy he will suddenly fall upon and ruin British Sea-power. Prince Louis of Battenberg occupies an extremely difficult and delicate position, which naturally excites personal sympathy for him, but we cannot think he will long remain where he is, not only because no gentleman can tolerate Mr. Churchill, but because his own position is impossible.

For the moment I am only concerned with the fact that there is yet another "Admiralty" claiming outworn authority, and should this "Admiralty" tell us to throw our coal overboard and place British sea-power at the mercy of the Standard Oil Company, or one or other of its nominal competitors, let us remember the record of previous "Admiralties" since the beginning of this century, each of which in turn claimed Papal infallibility, while each has been proved by subsequent events to have been as unworthy of public confidence as the Post Office in its incredible negotiations with the Marconi Company.

This brings me to the spot I started from, which may remind the reader of our friend the Village Idiot. Is it reasonable to compare the conduct of one of the great wise and eminent

occupants of the Treasury Bench to that of a village idiot, especially when he possesses the unbounded confidence of his Press, his party, and his colleagues? It ought to be unreasonable, even idiotic, to deal with our public men in such a manner, but it may not be uncharitable and I have no wish to be unfair even though Mr. Samuel may be offensive. The present Postmaster-General has never been regarded by those who know him as either a knave or a fool. Perhaps we are confronted by the not uncommon instance of a hide-bound Mandarin consumed with conceit and resolutely refusing to admit the possibility of his having made a mistake long after his folly stared him in the face. As a consequence, like many clever men before him—and history will doubtless repeat itself—he plunged into the morass of blunders from which a friendly Select Committee of the House of Commons has been vainly endeavouring to extricate him and his inept department. At the end of three months the Marconi Committee politely advised the course which, but for his bureaucratic arrogance, Mr. Herbert Samuel would spontaneously have adopted at the very outset of the discussion as to the best scheme of wireless telegraphy for the British Empire—namely, that the problem be submitted to an independent body of scientific experts. It is so simple and so obvious as to render the performance of the Postmaster-General bewildering and to emphasise the sinister aspects of an unpleasant business. Ministers are furious when this topic is mentioned, but they have no one to thank for the suspicions that have been roused but themselves in general and the Postmaster-General in particular.

What with the silver scandals, incipient oil scandals, the Honours debauch, and this Marconi business, intelligent people are beginning to ask themselves whether Costa Rica government is not carrying the country to the brink of "a Radical Panama." First take the theory that Mr. Samuel is the embodiment of efficiency, to whom there is no superior in the Cabinet, and in the graphic phrase of the *Daily Chronicle* is "always master of his tasks." Then read the specious, sophistical, deceptive speech with its impudent manipulation of facts with which he momentarily misled the House of Commons during the Marconi debate on October 11, and provoked the hysterical plaudits, not only of Coalition newspapers, which are always at the service of Coalition

Ministers whatever their blunders or their crimes, but the scarcely less ecstatic delight of so-called "Unionist" papers, which were enchanted by the manner in which Ministers had cleared their spotless, stainless reputations.

Note the closing words of this "triumphant vindication" of a business which is now recognised as being one of the most painful fiascoes of our time even on the evidence of the host of official witnesses who have been mobilised by the Post Office, the Treasury, and the Admiralty to bolster up an impossible agreement which never survived the cross-examination of Sir Alexander King, the permanent head of the Post Office. After a misleading speech occupying several pages of the Official Report, our self-complacent Postmaster was so delighted with himself that he sat down on the following peroration: "Hon. Members have made many accusations and many criticisms. Is there any charge left against the Government? There is no response. Well, Sir, I have done." This is the cheap flap-doodle which nowadays captivates the House of Commons. The boast was premature. Mr. Samuel had not "done." He had only begun, as he has subsequently discovered to his cost. Our readers are familiar with the sequel. After an exceptional delay, which was generally attributed to the difficulties of the Government in shutting out such cogent Radical critics of the Marconi Agreement as Sir George Croydon Marks and Sir Henry Norman, a Select Committee of the House of Commons to report on the Marconi Agreement was appointed consisting of fifteen Members of Parliament, presided over by a Radical, Sir Albert Spicer, on which there was a Coalition majority of nine to six. The Government assumed as a matter of course that this Committee would forthwith report in favour of the Agreement, paint the rose by endorsing Mr. Samuel's vindication of himself, and whitewash all the Ministers involved. That is what nine people out of ten expected. I personally shared this delusion, as there have been extraordinarily few manifestations of Radical independence during the last few years. I dreaded lest we should find ourselves in the grip of a perilous monopoly and that on some specious pretext of urgency, strategy or Imperialism, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs would get his ten per cent. No one, however, who has had an opportunity of reading the evidence—I do not mean the critical evidence of Sir George Croydon Marks, Sir Henry Norman,

and Major Archer Shee, who between them riddled the Agreement and showed that there was no shadow of a pretext for signing it, but the bureaucratic evidence which flowed abundantly from our Public Departments and was clearly designed to sweep the Committee off their feet—imagined for a moment that any honest body of men who released themselves from the poison of party prejudice could contemplate ratifying a compact the negotiation of which was characterised throughout by an ineptitude probably unmatched in British departmental annals—to say nothing of other suspicious circumstances. At any rate nothing worse has yet been exposed to the public view. One day I hope to set forth the whole story in the *National Review*, which its readers know has, in season and out of season, fought in conjunction with the *Outlook*, with the aid of the admirable and well-informed pen of Mr. Lawson, against the Marconi Agreement. It is only right that the public who pay the piper should know the manner of service they receive from so-called public servants, and that Mandarins and bureaucrats should be taught that you may fool all the people for some time, and some people for all time, but that you cannot fool all people for all time. This legend might advantageously be inscribed in gold at short intervals and in conspicuous places throughout our Public Departments.

After three months of conscientious and laborious efforts to ascertain the why and the wherefore of the Marconi Agreement, and to probe the Marconi mania which obsessed the Post Office and spread to other departments, the Select Committee wisely decided that it was beyond their capacities to probe the mysteries of wireless telegraphy, and they invited Mr. Herbert Samuel, the Postmaster-General who had "done" with the business on October 11, to express his views on January 13 upon an Interim Report suggesting the advisability of referring technical matters to an independent Committee of experts. In order to appreciate the piquancy of the position it must be remembered that the Postmaster-General and the Marconi Company had hoped to hustle the Agreement through Parliament practically undiscussed, because it would not bear discussion, before the adjournment of the House of Commons last summer, and the Government were only prevented from making the question one of confidence and devoting the whole resources of the Coalition to carrying it,

as they have carried the Home Rule Bill, and are carrying the Welsh Disestablishment Bill, by unwonted murmurs from their own side and by the threat of the Opposition to prolong an exhausting Session. Mr. Asquith found himself constrained to make a graceful concession. The ratification of the Agreement was held over until the autumn, and was to be subject to the approval of a Select Committee. Thus was breathing-time gained for Mr. W. R. Lawson and others to enlighten the public and to establish the fact that no British Government had a right to countenance such negotiations, still less to countenance a contract tainted by many unpleasant elements.

We can imagine the shock to Mr. Herbert Samuel's nerves when he was invited to appear before the Select Committee and give his opinion on the proposed expert Committee. So far as he was concerned, the matter was done with. "He is always master of his tasks." The Marconi Agreement was his handiwork. He had condescended to explain it to the House of Commons. *Bos locutus est*. What more could be wanted? What right had any Select Committee with a clear Coalition majority of nine to six to question the proceedings or policy of a still more select Minister, admittedly the most efficient member of the Cabinet? The contrast between the "triumphant vindication" in the House of Commons and the panic-stricken appeal to the Marconi Committee by Mr. Herbert Samuel is not the least entertaining episode in latter-day politics.

The Chairman of the Select Committee (Sir Albert Spicer) in the first instance read to the Postmaster-General (who was already apprised of its contents) the draft Interim Report which had been adopted by a majority of nine to four (in a Committee of fifteen, Mr. Mooney being an absentee) suggesting that without committing themselves to the Marconi Company or to any other system sites should be immediately purchased for wireless stations large enough for Marconi installations, but that whatever solution of the problem might be ultimately recommended, it would be necessary "to come to a conclusion as to the technical and scientific merits of the various systems. For this purpose the Committee believe that the best results will be reached by the immediate appointment of a highly qualified technical Committee similar in character to the Explosives Committee. Such a Committee would

be able to advise, not only as to the system to be adopted in the first instance, but, if so desired, as to any changes of system which may from time to time be necessary." Otherwise the present Committee would be compelled "to enter themselves upon a scientific and technical enquiry for which they do not feel themselves qualified."

Needless to say, the Postmaster-General resorted to every conceivable artifice to induce the Committee to reconsider its attitude—bluff, misrepresentation, cajolery. The most efficient member of the Cabinet made a pitiable exhibition of himself, which, however, so far from shaking his hearers, confirmed their desire for the appointment of an independent Committee which would not be a purely departmental affair. They had evidently had a dose of the department and fully appreciated the genius lurking in the Post Office. Mr. Herbert Samuel began by explaining, in his highest and mightiest Front Bench manner, that he had had the advantage of being able "to consult the officials of the Departments concerned—the Admiralty, the War Office, the Treasury, the Colonial Office, and my own Department, and the High Commissioner of South Africa—and it (acquaintance with the contents of the Interim Report) has also given me the opportunity of ascertaining the views of some of my colleagues who are also directly affected." That ought to have sufficed. The Committee were condescendingly told that the Government favoured an immediate selection of sites, a suggestion they "will be most happy to act upon." But our Marconi-mad Postmaster-General let it be seen that he could not conceive of any selection of sites without the approval of the Marconi Company.

After a good deal more verbiage, he fired off his first big shot in the shape of a communication that had been vamped up from "the Admiralty," to the effect that that Department was more than ever disinclined to have anything to do with the erection of wireless stations, while "the Post Office has neither the staff nor the experience which would entitle it to consider itself qualified to undertake the actual erection of these stations, and the direct conduct of so large an enterprise as this." We do not for a moment wish to exaggerate the powers of Parliament, but the immediate danger which threatens this country is the encroachment of the Executive. If the House of Commons directed the almighties of "the Admiralty,"

or the Post Office, to erect wireless stations and voted the necessary appropriation, that task would have to be carried out. It is not for the Postmaster-General to instruct the House of Commons as to what the Post Office alias himself may wish to do, but for the House of Commons to give its orders to that Department. The fact is that the unfortunate Minister is conscious of having perpetrated a frightful "floater"—to use a term popular with the younger generation—owing to the official obsession, and if he had been the representative of the Marconi Company he could not have protested more vehemently or more ridiculously against the sensible suggestion of the Select Committee. There was indeed no end to the nonsense he talked in trying to save his own bacon. The Expert Committee might be divided! They might take some time over their task! Inventors or other Companies might come forward undertaking to demonstrate the superiority of their apparatus either in whole or in part to that of their rival! However, that cock wouldn't fight. So he tried another, suggesting that the Expert Committee should be instructed to report in some impossible time. This horror of delay on the part of a Minister who has probably wasted more time over wireless telegraphy than anybody else is supremely comic. Among other humorous passages was the following: "It is not enough to have experiments, however interesting and promising, in a laboratory or over short range. Such experiments may be very attractive to experts and may influence, and properly influence, the opinion of experts; they may influence, and properly influence, the opinion of gentlemen engaged in financial transactions, and may induce and rightly induce them to form syndicates or companies and, having confidence in the future of this system or that, to lay down money in order to develop the system and make it a working proposition." And this from the man under whose very nose one of the most gigantic gambles of modern times has taken place owing to the negotiations between the Post Office and the Company, which enabled the parent to produce a litter of offspring and to do the various things so trenchantly condemned by Mr. Herbert Samuel. This gem is worthy of the rest, "but I do not think that the State in a matter of this sort should speculate if there is any other course open to it. That has been my view from the beginning."

Then as a drowning man clutches at a straw Mr. Herbert

Samuel suggested that the Committee could make up its mind "without hearing any elaborate technical evidence or even after correspondence, or, as I say, if they prefer it the Government Departments could make the enquiry. Then if tests are desired such tests could be made by the Government by its own officers, and possibly it might have some outside assistance from gentlemen whose names, if it were desired, could be submitted to this Committee." Mr. Samuel evidently rates parliamentary intelligence low when in the light of all that had transpired he invited the Select Committee to hand back to the Government, *i.e.* himself, the task so grossly mismanaged. "Those tests could as well be made really without the technical Committee as with it." Doubtless from the Postmaster-General's point of view. By this time he realised that he had gone too far, but when those who are too clever by half over-reach themselves they habitually become more stupid than the most stupid. Listen to this from our patriotic Postmaster-General: "Would it be in the interests of the State that the contract for these stations, which are being erected primarily for strategical reasons, should be placed in the hands of any foreign company *which was in the closest touch with a foreign Government and which had equipped, let us say, the navy of that foreign Government*" [our italics]? Now in the first place the contract with the Marconi Company does not put strategy but commerce in the forefront, and it is obvious that a minimum of strategic urgency attaches to the problem, as otherwise we could scarcely imagine the Admiralty refusing to touch it with a barge pole. In the second place, what is the Marconi Company but a foreign company, and its largest shareholders, if the extraordinary transactions that have taken place abroad are *bona fide* and not the disguises which British politicians have adopted for purposes of speculation, are foreigners and somewhat undesirable foreigners. Finally, when the speaker tries to make the flesh of the Committee creep by referring to the dire possibility of dealing with a company which might have equipped a foreign navy, is it not the fact that the Marconi system is installed in the Italian navy, and that Italy is a member of the Triple Alliance? The recent Admiralty Memorandum shows that even "the Admiralty" recognises the fleets of the Triple Alliance as virtually German fleets. In fact, every single proposition of the Postmaster-General collapses at the first touch, and to the credit of the Committee be it said, they

pulled up the Marconi advocate when he began launching forth into the usual official diatribe against competitive systems. When at last he saw that the game was up Mr. Herbert Samuel insidiously suggested "that if the evidence before the Committee leads them to think that the Contract needs any alteration . . . well and good." Anything sooner than that the Marconi Agreement—for which let me say what has been said before in the *National Review*, the Marconi Company bears no shadow of blame because it was fully entitled to take advantage of the fact that the Post Office was largely tenanted by "rabbits" in order to make the best bargain it could in the interests of its shareholders—should be submitted to a body of capable and independent experts. The piteous peroration in which Mr. Samuel concluded his evidence ran as follows:

> I foresee the greatest possible difficulty in selecting the individuals to form this Committee if it is to be independent both of the Government and all the various wireless systems, and is at the same time to consist of men who are really experts in wireless telegraphy, whose opinion would carry the greatest authority. I do not know whether the Committee have in their mind any particular names, but if so I shall be very glad indeed to consider them *should the Committee propose to go on with this proposition* [our italics], but for my part, after consulting with others, I can only say that the selection of such a Committee would be a task of the most formidable magnitude.

The upshot was as amusing and surprising as everything else in this affair. The Select Committee two days later issued a Special Report—a revised version of the draft Interim Report—recognising the urgency of establishing a chain of Imperial wireless stations, and the desirability of erecting the first six wireless stations in the countries or places specified in the Marconi Agreement where a site should be secured "large enough for a Marconi or any other installation." Whatever system of wireless telegraphy might be ultimately adopted, and whether or not the present Agreement as it stands or modified be confirmed, they were of opinion "that with respect to the construction and installation of such wireless stations, especially in view of what has been stated in the course of the present enquiry, as to the developments that are said to have taken place in wireless telegraphy during the last few months, the Government must be free to adopt or reject any system from time to time." The Committee adhered to the suggestion, despite the special pleading of Mr. Samuel, that it was desirable to secure the views "of a highly qualified *Committee containing* eminent *scientific experts*, and presided

over by a Chairman of recognised judicial or administrative ability" to report on the merits of existing systems of long-distance wireless telegraphy, "and in particular as to their capacity for a continuous communication over the distances required by the Imperial chain." "This Committee therefore recommends that:

"(1) The Government take steps to secure sites for wireless stations in the countries or places mentioned in the second article of the Agreement.

"(2) The Government appoint a Scientific Committee as indicated above."

A few hours later, Sir Albert Spicer asked the Postmaster-General in the House of Commons whether the Special Report of the Marconi Committee had been considered by the Government, and what action they proposed to take. And that woe-begone Minister, "the master of all his tasks" with all the gas knocked out of him, had the humiliation of declaring: "These recommendations, in their present form, substantially meet the representations which were made to the Committee on behalf of the Government, and the Government will be glad to give immediate effect to them." There are some men and several Ministers who enjoy eating dirt. They have been broken in by their Irish taskmasters. After this wonderful *volte-face*, it was scarcely surprising to learn—even if it was only a piece of bluff—that the Marconi Company through their appointed mouthpiece, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, asked to be allowed to be released from their contract with their fickle friends at the Post Office, and in making this request the Managing Director let yet another cat out of the bag, for which we are grateful. It has been consistently maintained by the *National Review* that the success of this hole and corner Agreement depended upon its immediate ratification without serious scrutiny, and Mr. Godfrey Isaacs pathetically complained in his letter to the Postmaster-General (dated Marconi House, Strand, January 15), "When I submitted to your Department the Tender of March 7, my Company contemplated that the Agreement would be drawn up forthwith, and that within a very few weeks it would have been submitted to Parliament and ratified." This was a natural expectation on the

part of the Company which had learnt during their intimate relations with the Government that they had only to ask in order to receive, and there is little room for doubt that their Ministerial friends intended, as we have said, to hustle the Agreement through Parliament by the usual machinery. That the plot failed is due to the persistent and determined opposition of a handful of people belonging we are glad to say to both Parties, inside and outside the House of Commons, who have prevented an arrangement infinitely advantageous to the Marconi Company and infinitely disastrous on all grounds to National and Imperial interests. But it would be unwise on the part of any watchdog to relax his vigilance, as the peril may reappear in some new form and there are other aspects of the question to be probed.

As the readers of this Review may have occasionlly seen mysterious and menacing paragraphs concerning peremptory summonses to editors or other journalists who have dared to criticise this sacrosanct Agreement, and who are only too ready to testify before the Committee and to assist them to probe this unique transaction, I intended to append to this article the précis of evidence which I submitted to the Marconi Committee some weeks ago, when I was first asked to give evidence, but unfortunately, although I have been kept hanging about since January 1, at the time of writing it is impossible to ascertain when this evidence will be taken, and I am obliged to hold over the précis. The evidence given on behalf of the Government, presumably marshalled by the Post Office, conclusively shows that over and over again the upward movements in Marconi shares followed hard upon confidential negotiations between an exacting Company and a gelatinous Department, clearly demonstrating serious leakage somewhere which enabled great fortunes to be made by the lucky ones "in the know." We are reminded of the famous South Sea Bubble unless it be a Radical "Panama." Surely Ministers, who were so eloquent and indignant on October 11, have been ill-advised in remaining silent throughout the intervening months. The good name of our public men is an asset and the country is entitled to know that the Cabinet is exclusively composed of Cæsar's Wives.

L. J. MAXSE.

GREATER BRITAIN AND INDIA

CANADIAN AFFAIRS

1

SIR WILFRID LAURIER's amendment of the Naval Aid resolution is a notable document. If it were passed, Canada would be committed to the construction and maintenance of two Fleet Units, one on either coast-line. A Fleet Unit of ships of the latest design would cost at least $21,000,000 ; so that the Liberal amendment, though its first clause is taken from Mr. Borden's resolution and authorises the expenditure of $35,000,000 only, would cost $42,000,000 to carry out. Moreover, the annual cost of maintaining the two units would certainly exceed $7,000,000. Here is the text of the Liberal amendment which is clearly the work of an old and clever Parliamentary hand rather than that of a serious student of naval affairs :

That from and out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada there may be paid and applied a sum not exceeding thirty-five million dollars for the purpose of immediately increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire.

The memorandum prepared by the Board of Admiralty on the general naval situation of the Empire and communicated to this House by the right hon. the Prime Minister on December 5, shows that several of the most important of the foreign Powers have adopted a definite policy of rapidly increasing their naval strength.

That this condition has compelled the United Kingdom to concentrate its naval forces in home waters, involving the withdrawal of ships from the outlying portions of the Empire.

That such withdrawal renders it necessary that Canada, without further delay, should enter actively upon a permanent policy of naval defence.

That any measure of Canadian aid to Imperial Naval Defence which does not employ a permanent policy of participation by ships owned, manned, and maintained by Canada and contemplating construction as soon as possible in Canada, is not an adequate or satisfactory expression of the aspirations of the Canadian people in regard to naval defence, and is not an assumption by Canada of her fair share in the maintenance of the naval strength of the Empire.

This House regrets to learn the intention of the Government to postpone indefinitely the carrying out by Canada of a permanent naval policy; it is the opinion of this House that measures should be taken at the present session to give effect actively and speedily to the permanent naval policy embodied in the Naval Service Act of 1910, passed pursuant to the resolution unanimously approved by this House in March 1909.

This House is further of opinion that to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial Navy by the addition by Canada under the above Act of two fleet units, to be stationed on the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts of Canada respectively, rather than by a contribution of money or ships, is the policy best calculated to afford relief to the United Kingdom in respect to the burden of Imperial Naval Defence, and in the words of the Admiralty Memorandum, to restore greater freedom to the movements of the British Squadrons in every sea, and directly promote the security of the Dominions; and that the Government of Canada should take such steps as shall lead to the accomplishment of this purpose as speedily as possible.

If it was passed, this amendment would be a vote of censure on the Borden Administration for not giving effect to the Naval Service Act of 1910 which the Liberal Party when in power did not press forward energetically—for fear, no doubt, of awakening the animosity of the Quebec Nationalists and the Do-Nothings of Ontario on the eve of a General Election. As an outline of naval policy it is altogether unconvincing. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his lieutenants draw a dreadful picture of a niggardly Government sending empty ships to exhaust the resources of personnel in the Mother Country, whereas "England" (it is always England, never the Empire, with the Leader of the Opposition) "wants the hearts, the brains, and the brawn of her subjects all over the world." Yet these very rhetoricians, if the Borden programme had suggested that Canada should man the three battleships, would have gone up and down Quebec during the Christmas holidays and tried to terrify the French-Canadian peasant-farmer by telling him that his children were to be deported to fight England's battles. Canada could not in any case provide the 5000 men required for two Fleet Units. The *Niobe* and the *Rainbow*, which were procured in 1910, had, up to the end of March 1912, obtained 349 recruits, of whom nearly one-third had deserted. The Fleet Unit plan, if carried out with despatch, would drain 4000 men at least from the Royal Navy to man vessels sequestered in the Pacific or separated from the danger-zone by the whole expanse of the Atlantic. In such circumstances the Canadian Fleet would be a hindrance rather than helpful in the task of securing the Empire against the predatory Power which at present menaces its

existence. Until Canada has created a large Naval reserve by (1) some extension of the militia system, and (2) by tapping the resources of Newfoundland, the greatest nursery of sailors in the Empire, with the co-operation of the Government at St. John's, she could not hope to man a single Fleet Unit without drawing seamen and stokers from Great Britain. Finally, it is folly to think of creating a shipbuilding industry in Canada by producing a Fleet Unit as a beginning. The chief interest of the Liberal pronouncement, which comes too late in the day to be taken seriously, consists in the fact that it commits the Liberal Party, as a party, to an even more munificent expenditure on sea-power than that contemplated by their opponents. I have never disguised my conviction that the Canadian Liberals, with very few exceptions, and those disposed in Quebec or the polyglot settlements of the West, are capable of thinking Imperially and, in so far as their lip-service to the fallacies of Cobdenism permits, of acting Imperially. And the Imperialist in the Mother Country or in the other Dominions may contemplate with equanimity the course of the naval controversy in Canada now that it has resolved itself into a competition as to which party should show the greater willingness to spend money on the increase of Imperial sea-power. Nor will he forget that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, though by nature a politician rather than a statesman, and unable to throw off his allegiance to the disintegrating principles of Fox and Gladstone, was the first to take up the question of naval policy in downright earnest, despite the savage criticisms of his French-speaking compatriots and the opposition of all to whom the blessed word "anti-militarism" is a sacrosanct shibboleth. Because he blundered into Reciprocity (for which blunder he has paid the penalty) we must never forget his great services in the past to Canada and to the Empire—not the least of theso being his vindication of the constructive policy of Imperial Preference.

Before framing their amendment the Liberal leaders had discovered that English-speaking Canada was virtually a unit in favour of Mr. Borden's proposals and that any overt opposition on their part to a substantial measure of aid would be tantamount to committing political suicide. During the Christmas holidays they seem to have discovered that the temper of the people is such that to face a General Election, either by obstruction in the House

of Commons or by using the Liberal majority in the Senate, would only tend to a further reduction in their Parliamentary forces. Sir George Ross, whose Imperialism cannot be questioned, has been elected leader by the Liberal Senators, and this fact is regarded as a proof that, in the last resort, the Senate would refuse to reject the Naval Aid Bill. To do so for purely political purposes would bring down the long-threatened attack on a Secondary Chamber which many Canadians in both parties look upon as an unnecessary body, useful only as a refuge for superannuated politicians who have to be kicked upstairs. The result is that a desire for compromise has already been expressed among the rank-and-file of the Opposition, and it would not be surprising if, by the time these remarks appear in print, a definite proposal has been made to the master of the situation, Mr. R. L. Borden. It is highly improbable that he would consent to cut the number of "Dreadnoughts" down from three to two, using the price of the third for carrying out a naval scheme on the lines worked out in the Act of 1910. It is possible that some small concession, sufficient to "save face" for the Liberal Imperialists, might be offered and accepted. In that case the Bill would be passed unanimously and "God Save the King" would be sung by everybody in the House with the possible exception of Mr. Oliver, ex-Minister of the Interior, whose attitude is inexplicable, having regard to his past record. And, even if no concession be made, I for one should not be surprised if unanimity is eventually reached. Sir Wilfrid Laurier may remember that when the Canadian Confederacy was in the making, his strong and incorruptible predecessor in the Liberal leadership, George Brown, who created the *Toronto Globe*, decided to act with Sir John Macdonald in order that the world might have a due sense of Canadian unity then to be implemented. If he thinks fit to do so that Canada's gift may convey an object-lesson *urbi et orbi* of the solidarity of Canadian Imperialism, he will be acting with the statesmanlike generosity which, after all, is the basis of his character.

2

The retreat of the Unionist Party from the position they have hitherto maintained in regard to Imperial Preference is lamented by all those Canadian Imperialists whose study of the facts has

convinced them that the imposition of a tax of two shillings per quarter on foreign-grown wheat would not increase the price of bread for the British consumer any more than does the raising of freight-rates by the transportation companies operating between the American wheat-fields and the British seaports. The phrase of a Canadian friend—"They are presenting Mr. Chamberlain's head on a charger to the shade of Cobden"—puts the matter in a nutshell. One might add that (1) the gift is really for Ure and Co. (unlimited lie-ability), and (2) that the charger is neither rich nor rare, neither of silver nor of gold, being merely a copy of a certain halfpenny paper. Liberals naturally applaud the abandonment of a strategical position that was becoming stronger every year; it is a vindication, in their opinion, of the sacred principles of Cobdenism, more especially that which advocated cheap food in order to cheapen the British working man. Without discriminating duties on food-stuffs there can never be a treaty of mutual preference between Canada and Great Britain. Unless this fatal retreat be arrested without delay Reciprocity must again become a predominant issue in Canadian politics. Nobody who has studied economics of the North American wheat industry believes that Mr. Chamberlain's proposals would increase the price of bread; otherwise they would never have been favoured in Canada. Preference is seen by them to be transference; that is to say, it would vastly accelerate the settlement of Canada's half of the prairie-region by American farmers and so greatly increase the supply of Western wheat, since the Canadian farm-lands lie nearer to the northern limit of cultivation and have better soil than those below the forty-ninth parallel of latitude, so that the gain in production would be twofold. The Canadian disciple of Chamberlain looks to the younger men of the Unionist Party to prefer statesmanship to expediency and to put the authors of the recent stampede in a place where they cannot exploit the "yellow streak" of a timorous, time-saving minority by yellow-press methods.

E. B. O.

INDIA

A REVIEW OF CURRENT ISSUES

Any attempt to examine some of the current issues of Indian politics is necessarily overshadowed by the outrage which so nearly caused the deaths of the Viceroy and Lady Hardinge at Delhi on December 23. The horror of the crime has been fully realised in this country, but not its gravity. That it will not be suffered to retard the development of beneficent reforms under British rule in India goes without saying. Soon after the wounded Viceroy was carried to his official residence he "spontaneously said that this attempt upon his life had not made any change in his feeling towards India and the people of India, nor would it cause any change in his attitude or policy. He was only filled with sympathy at the shame and horror with which India must regard the attempt, and depressed by that thought." The "shame and horror" to which Lord Hardinge alluded have been amply revealed in the innumerable meetings held throughout India, at which resolutions of sympathy and indignation were passed. There can be no doubt about their absolute sincerity. Those who know India know full well that by all but a handful of the people such a crime would be held in absolute detestation. The Indian peoples dislike political murders. The reason why experienced officials have been wont to move freely among the population is that they know the natural instinct of the race is not to attack Englishmen. Police officers are familiar with the trend of public feeling in the matter. It will be an evil day for Englishmen in India if this salutary and pacific disposition is in any degree impaired.

The gravity of the situation is that, so far as Viceroys are concerned, the old feeling of comparative security has gone, and is not likely soon to recur. It is evident that there is a band of implacable men in India, probably still small, for whom high place possesses no sanctity. Henceforth the Viceroy must be protected and guarded as Lord Minto was guarded during a specially troublous period. His movements must be restricted, his public progresses preceded by an enormous amount of police preparation. When he traverses the crowded bazaars of an

Indian city, the houses along the line of route must be cleared of suspicious characters, as they were—very quietly—when Lord Minto went to Lucknow. There must be no more elephant processions; they make the head of the Government too conspicuous a mark for the bomb-thrower. The astonishing thing is that although Lord Hardinge's elephant was passing between lines of armed troops, although it was accompanied by police officers carrying revolvers, although Lord Hardinge was "escorted" by cavalry and had the services of a splendid "Body-guard," he was struck down while those around him were unaware of what had happened. The immense height of the elephant lent by the State of Faridkot, on which the Viceroy was riding, caused the crime to pass for a few moments unperceived. It was a tragedy in mid-air.

It is easy now to say that the nearest company officers of the 60th Rifles should immediately have ordered their men to enter the house from which the bomb was thrown. But they did not know what had happened; the procession moved another hundred and fifty yards before Lord Hardinge, recovering from the stunning effect of the shock, directed it to stop; and the orders for ceremonial occasions do not appear to instruct subordinate officers regarding their duties in the event of such an outrage. Their immediate business was to keep the streets clear; had they broken rank, the Chandni Chauk would have been filled with wild disorder; and while nobody quite knew what to do even when the news became known, the culprit or culprits escaped. It is practically certain that they would have escaped in any case. So well planned a crime was not committed without ample provision for swift retreat. We are confronted with the fact that Viceroys are no longer safe from attack on public occasions, and must be shielded accordingly. It is a disagreeable awakening. It is a reminder that, as the present writer has so often urged, the Indian Anarchist is never so dangerous as when the country seems most quiet. That is the time when he prefers to strike. There must be no more false security engendered by "lulls" and "prolonged absence of outrage."

The position of the Viceroy, already painfully isolated and overborne by manifold duties, henceforth becomes doubly disagreeable. Brave Englishmen will not thereby be deterred from

filling it, but they will find it more irksome than ever. The splendour of the position is overclouded. We may be certain that this is not the last of the Anarchist outrages in India. That the actual perpetrators, and the men behind them—the latter are far more important—will still be discovered, I firmly believe. The man who threw the bomb at Lord Hardinge was not working alone. He must have had accomplices on the spot, and there must have been others who knew that the deed was to be attempted. No secret of the kind was ever kept for very long in India. The peculiarity of Indian life is that every secret known by more than one man leaks out in time. The rewards offered in this case are enormous. They will not be withdrawn, and they tempt cupidity. Long after the Delhi Durbar of 1903, it became known that two men who were among the earlier Anarchists, went to Delhi to assassinate Lord Curzon; but their hearts failed them, or perhaps they did not possess suitable weapons. I do not believe that a long period will elapse before the conspiracy which led to the Delhi outrage will be unmasked; and the only important precedent which weakens this belief is that the attempt to "bomb" Lord and Lady Minto, at Ahmedabad, was never completely unravelled.

One result of the Delhi outrage is that it has emphasised the difference between the Anarchists and the ordinary Indian politician, who is opposed to the general policy of the British Government, but conducts his opposition by constitutional methods. In extreme cases the dividing line has not always been easy to draw, and there has been a disposition in the public mind to mix up Anarchist outrages with normal agitation. Lord Minto on several occasions pointedly emphasised the difference between the two. Whatever may be thought of the political occurrences of the past two years, no man has more deserved the confidence of the "Nationalist" party than Lord Hardinge. He "reconstituted" Bengal, and gave the Beharis the separate province they professed to crave. Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee and Lala Lajpat Rai vied in sounding his praises at the National Congress the other day, and the former declared that the Viceroy would "stand forth in history as the pacifier of Bengal." The point I seek to urge is that the Anarchists are a class apart. No concession will satisfy them. If India had complete self-government to-

morrow, they would still be throwing bombs at the powers that be. Rigorous and uncompromising repression is the only remedy in their case. When discovered, they should receive swift trial and condign punishment. The scandal of the interminable Manicktollah garden conspiracy case should never again be repeated. If the ordinary processes of the Indian courts are to be invoked whenever Anarchists are caught red-handed, the evil will never be extirpated. The corollary of the dictum that British rule in India will continue to follow the pathway of reform is that at the same time Anarchists must be handled ruthlessly and rapidly. If some further change is not made in the mode of conducting Anarchist trials, the time will come when British rule in India will be paralysed. Except in certain instances, the "Special Tribunals" have failed to expedite the trials of political criminals. They are hardly more expeditious than the ordinary courts.

I do not advocate drum-head courts-martial for ordinary political offenders, persons charged with sedition, and similar criminals; but where there are clear *prima facie* cases of Anarchism, where men are charged with political murders or attempted murders, where conspirators are found throwing or making bombs, I would institute short sharp trials and exemplary sentences. The law of the frontier must be transplanted to deal with Anarchists. The murderer of a British officer on the frontier receives short shrift; in Calcutta such an offender would probably get a 200-days' trial, the glory of an appeal, the knowledge that the Government were spending thousands of pounds to secure his conviction, and perhaps a modification of his sentence at the end. Special forms of trial for Indian Anarchists may not come yet; but when a few more bombs have been thrown, and more high officials have been mangled, the folly of long trials in such cases will perhaps be recognised. No voice in India would now be raised against such a change in the machinery of the law. Another result of the Delhi outrage ought to be the strengthening of the police charged with hunting down Anarchists. The principal breeding-ground is still Eastern Bengal, as it always was; and the criminal statistics of Eastern Bengal remain a standing disgrace to British rule in India.

It is a more agreeable task to turn from these topics to the general questions of Indian politics. Lord Hardinge was attacked just as he was about to take over, on behalf of the Government of India, the *enclave* in which the new capital is to be built. Most contradictory opinions are still expressed regarding the attitude of Indian public opinion towards the change of capital. On the one hand, it is clear that the princes of India welcome the change; on the other, it is equally clear that Calcutta remains unreconciled, while Bombay and Madras appear to be lukewarm. On the whole, it may be said that there is now very little active opposition, but while large sections of the Indian communities applaud the transfer, a larger proportion awaits the creation of the new city with passivity mingled with a little scepticism about its success. The special committee sent out from England is about to present its report on the site, but unfortunately the controversy regarding the style of architecture to be adopted is still unsettled. Lord Hardinge is believed not to have abandoned his conception of a somewhat Oriental city. The advocates of "Classic or Renaissance" are still fighting vigorously. Sentimental people who know nothing about architecture have managed to drag "the spirit of Indian Nationalism" into the dispute. What ought to have been a question of art is becoming a question of politics. In the meantime New Delhi is not getting built, and one fears that the attack on the Viceroy may delay its progress. My own view is that the question of architecture is not the greatest danger the new project has to face. Its danger is that when finished it may remain a splendid torso. The capital of an Empire is only impressive when its great public buildings and official residences are set in the midst of a vast population. The bungalows of officials, the dwellings of the Indian princes, the few shops and offices required to supply their needs, will not suffice to give New Delhi the human setting it requires; while the older walled city beyond may even convey an impression of separation. However, we can only await the result of an effort which will assuredly not lack energy.

Perhaps the most striking and hopeful fact about India just now is the remarkable success of the new Councils. They are deeply appreciated by the leaders of public opinion, the debates are of high quality, and they afford ample opportunity for the

expression of the views of the people through their chosen spokesmen. They have had a genuine restraining influence upon political agitation, as distinguished from Anarchism. The best proof is that the Moderates have completely swept the field in the elections just held in Bengal, and the solitary Nationalist candidate who gained success was Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, who is a political chameleon. There has recently been some enlargement of the non-official element in various Provincial Councils, to which no exception need be taken. The Councils are still young bodies, but they are rapidly gaining in strength and experience. Even as at present constituted, they exercise large influence upon public policy; the eloquence of some of their members is by no means wasted; they are making very material modifications in the attitude of British officials towards the public, with the happiest results; and in a few years they will constitute a powerful factor in the control of India. I venture to predict that at no distant date Indian politicians will be found claiming a more direct voice in the shaping of both financial and fiscal policy. The Home Government override the views of the Government of India upon fiscal questions. One wonders what will be said in reply to united demands from the people of India.

Unhappily, although the Councils seem to have such a promising future before them, Indian politicians still appear to think their first duty is to clamour for a larger share of executive appointments. The whole question of simultaneous examinations in England and in India for the Indian Civil Service is coming to the front once more. The attack on the present system of examinations in England is more determined than ever. It forms the chief feature in the evidence now being given before the Royal Commission on the Indian Public Services, and there is a bitter division between the official and the non-official witnesses. It was the principal topic at the National Congress at Patna, for the Congress still exists, though the Councils have shorn it of much of its old importance. The President, Mr. Mudholkar, spoke on the subject at the usual inordinate length, and on the whole not convincingly. He ruined whatever case he had when he suggested that Indian candidates, after passing an examination in India, should spend two years at an English University to acquire those "mental and moral qualifications" which are best gained by

"contact with British institutions and society." If successful candidates are to go to England, why should they not go to England to be examined? Any weakening of the system of selection and examination of candidates for the Indian Civil Service will assuredly be deleterious to the quality and strength of British rule in India. The late Duke of Argyll said that the first duty of the British in India was to guard their own dominion, and they can only do that successfully through British agency. Not without good grounds, the Public Services Commission is regarded by British officials in India with alarm and mistrust.

The Army is also a little nervous, for the Nicholson Commission is still hatching "reforms," and no one quite knows what to expect. The report of Lord Nicholson and his colleagues was first looked for in November. Now March is mentioned, and it may be even later. The story that the office of Commander-in-Chief is to be abolished still persists, although strenuously denied. Such an abolition would be a terrible blunder, for the Indian Army needs a personal head endowed with real authority. The dual functions now discharged by the Commander-in-Chief are clearly proved to be beyond the strength of any one man. Sir O'Moore Creagh is swamped with papers and files, and has little time for personal contact with the Army. Some rearrangement of the present duties is certainly desirable, but that is a very different matter from the abolition of the Indian command. It has been said that the Commission will not concern itself with matters of high administration. We shall see. If it does not do so it will leave untouched the most vital source of mischief in the whole Indian Army system. That questions of transport must be adequately dealt with, and that the divisional system must be rendered thoroughly workable, are also questions of urgent necessity. The time will assuredly come when a severe strain will be placed upon the resources of the Indian Army. Southern Persia will not for ever be allowed to remain in a state of chaos. Intervention is most unwelcome, but if we do not soon intervene some other Power will. And intervention in Southern Persia means large demands on India's military resources.

The opium question is another issue which is likely to produce considerable perplexity in India in the coming year. The situation in China, where over £10,000,000 worth of Indian opium

has accumulated at the treaty ports, has at last compelled the Government of India to take action. For months they were pressed to suspend their opium sales, but refused to do so. Now they have yielded to absolute necessity, but as three months' notice of suspension must be given, the sales of opium cannot cease until March. The stoppage of the opium revenue will soon cause serious embarrassment to the Indian Exchequer. The huge surpluses of recent years have been treated as "windfalls," and have been devoted to special objects. Had the opium trade continued upon the lines of the original Agreement with China, and diminished gradually throughout a whole decade, the Government of India might have faced the disappearance of the revenue from opium with comparative calmness. But the actual course of events was quite different. There was a rush of large sums which were soon spent, and now there will be nothing, or next to nothing. It seems probable that some of the non-official members of Council were right when they pointed out the risk of spending the "windfalls" immediately, instead of husbanding them. Mr. Gokhale said in the Imperial Council on March 18, 1911: "If the opium revenue is extinguished in three years, as sure as the fact that we are in this room to-day, the Finance Department will have recourse to extra taxation to fill up the gap." Although India is now entering upon a trade boom without precedent, I fear this prediction will be fulfilled. The vast sums newly alloted for education and other purposes must be found somehow, and there is no way which will commend itself to the Home Government, save additional internal taxation.

I may also venture to recall a prediction I made in the *National Review* for June 1911, when I said that the opium traffic with China would be extinguished in eighteen months, and that the new taxation which would then become necessary would precipitate the coming conflict for fiscal autonomy. My words were flouted at the time, but one half of the prediction has now been fulfilled, and the other half will be found to be equally accurate. The possibility of fresh taxation is not the only trouble which looms ahead for the Government of India. They have to decide what is to be done about the £10,000,000 of unmarketable opium which is lying in the go-downs of Shanghai and Canton. A proposal now adumbrated is that the Government of India should

buy back the opium, because the present holders were induced to acquire it through faith in promises which have not been fulfilled. The Government of India sold the opium on the strength of Agreements with China which have been violated by the Chinese. If Great Britain feels morally unable to compel China to adhere to her undertakings, she ought to feel morally bound, in equal measure, to come to the relief of the traders and bankers who trusted to her treaty rights. It is urged: "You cannot profess to be almost violently moral in one direction and not in another." I do not at present feel disposed to endorse these contentions without reserve; I would rather "wait and see"; but clearly that vast stock of opium in Chinese go-downs puts the Government of India into a very awkward place.

The question of the control of Indian balances by the India Office, about which so much has been heard in Parliament of late, will certainly come into greater prominence during the current year. I propose to deal with it in detail in a later issue. Meanwhile it may be said that whether all the allegations recently advanced are true or not, a strong case has been made out for a thorough and searching enquiry into the working of the financial side of India Office Administration. A great deal of nonsense has been uttered on behalf of the Home Government regarding the "imperative necessity" of having City financiers upon the India Council. There is no real need for the presence of these gentlemen at all, unless the India Office is manned by incompetents; but if aid is sought from the City, then those who furnish such aid should not be concerned, either personally or through their banks or businesses, in transactions with the India Office. This is not a matter of accusation, but rather a matter of common expediency. Another question which must be reserved for future discussion is that of the present attitude of the Mahomedans of India. Their recent entente with the Nationalists, and their somewhat exaggerated protests concerning recent events in the Balkans, require plain speaking. Indian Moslems are at last spoiling their own case.

ASIATICUS.

THE NATIONAL REVIEW

No. 361. MARCH 1913

EPISODES OF THE MONTH

The New France

WHILE there is much to depress and even to distress patriotic Englishmen at the present time when a false and treacherous Government remains recreant to the most sacred of national trusts—the safety of the State—and a somnolent country acquiesces in this treason, we may at any rate take heart of grace from the splendid and stirring example of our brilliant neighbours across the Channel. Public opinion in France was sufficiently strong a year ago to clear out a Cabinet reasonably suspected of compromising national interests and of sacrificing France to Germany behind the back of Frenchmen, and to-day their country reaps its reward by regaining the moral leadership of Western Europe. What is so remarkable and inspiring in the spectacle of a regenerated France—from which an Englishman may be pardoned for deriving enjoyment only second to that derivable from a similar phenomenon in his own country—is that France is in some respects more heavily handicapped than we are. Her political and parliamentary system is little superior to ours, and it frequently happens that the men in control of the machine, as in this country, are inferior in outlook, in grit, and in patriotism to the bulk of the nation whose aspirations and ideals they woefully misrepresent. Then, again, in a Republic there is no institution nor necessarily any personality providing a rallying-ground in times of storm and

stress. In Russia the Tsar is notoriously an object of adoration to the great mass of the people. In Germany a picturesque Emperor rides the whirlwind and directs the storm whither he will. In the Dual Monarchy the venerable and venerated King-Emperor, in spite of the ambitious pretensions by which he is surrounded, still towers over all the communities constituting the amazing Mosaic over which he reigns. In Italy a sagacious statesman and a true friend of his people occupies the throne. In Spain a young, gallant and open-minded King makes a natural leader of the nation. We recognise the British Crown as the symbol of Imperial unity and of such national greatness as may be left to us after several years of the ravages of Lloyd George government, while the potentialities of the Throne if called upon are probably illimitable, and so on all round Europe, where at the present day the ability and prestige of the heads of States is probably greater than at any previous period. But France deliberately became and remained a Republic after being the most monarchical Power in Europe, and she has done almost everything which on accepted theories should have brought her to grief, and yet she stands to-day four square to all the winds that blow, animated by a serene but unaggressive self-confidence without any dominating institution or principle or personality. This makes her perhaps the most interesting of all the Powers. Young and ardent blood courses through the veins of an ancient and wonderful people. What does it all mean? How is it to be explained? Whence comes this marvellous recuperative force? How comes it that France appears over and over again to have shot her bolt, while friendly neighbours drop a sympathetic or hypocritical tear as the case may be, and then all of a sudden she turns the corner and seems as young, as strong, as fresh and as vigorous as ever?

A German Blunder

To those of us who regard France as their second country, but who would never sacrifice national interests to sentiment, it has been delightful to watch the transformation across the Channel because in this case our sentiments and our interests walk hand in hand. There is no greater British interest than a powerful, self-respecting, self-confident France, just as there would be no greater British danger

than an enfeebled, hesitating, demoralised France, unable to hold her own in the councils of Europe and to play her part in that Balance of Power which during critical years was imperilled by the misfortunes and effacement of Russia, which in their turn reacted upon Russia's ally. It seems only the other day that Kaiser Wilhelm II. demanded the head of M. Delcassé, the French Foreign Minister, on a charger for the unspeakable crime of having attached his signature to the Anglo-French Agreement of 1904, which closed the secular conflict between France and Great Britain and laid the foundations of the Entente which has since weathered many German storms. The attack on the French Foreign Minister, with the avowed object of humiliating the nation of which he was the public servant, occurred on the morrow of the Battle of Mukden. Russia was momentarily *hors de combat*. France was taken by surprise. The German Emperor had for so many years been prodigal of his flatteries to France and posed as her friend just as to-day he poses as the friend of England. Frenchmen could scarcely believe the evidence of their senses. It is hardly for us, with our Haldanes and Churchills, to speak of the Pelletans and Andrés who had prevented preparation from keeping pace with policy. France—perhaps we should say parliamentary France—felt that she had no alternative but to yield before the insolent menaces across the frontier, and M. Delcassé, who had occupied the French Foreign Office longer than any Minister except Guizot, went into the wilderness. The German triumph appeared complete, and to celebrate the event Count Bülow (then a highly favoured Chancellor) was ostentatiously made a Prince by a grateful Sovereign. Germany, however, can never rest on any laurels. Having publicly humiliated France Wilhelm II. proceeded to bully her, and it is an open secret that Lord Lansdowne, who was at the Foreign Office during this memorable episode in 1905, was obliged to give the German Ambassador in London the strongest possible hint as to the inevitable consequences of an unprovoked aggression upon France before the danger of "a preventive war" was dissipated. France was to be punished for the crime of making friends with Great Britain, and Great Britain naturally could not afford to stand by, but was constrained by every obligation of honour to make the French cause her own. Germany appreciated the position and

drew in her horns. In those days the British Navy was unchallengeable in ships as well as in speeches. Fisherism was in its infancy. We need not review the sequel, which has been frequently related in these pages.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman

In justice, however, to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who became Prime Minister at the end of 1905 (and however much the Cocoa Quakers, the Potsdam Party, and other malign alien influences and Anglophobe Radicals may dislike it), it must be remembered that though the then Liberal Leader may have cultivated somewhat childish illusions about The Hague Conference, he was sound upon European affairs. One of his first acts as Prime Minister was to make a resolute stand at the Algeciras Conference in the beginning of 1906, when Germany persuaded herself that the change of Government in England and the advent of the Radical Mountain to power offered a favourable opportunity for once more "testing" the solidarity of the Anglo-French friendship. The German Emperor not unnaturally misled by the general attitude of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and his colleagues on national questions, especially during the South African War, counted on regaining from the Radicals what he had lost in the previous summer when the Unionists were in power, and of effecting a severance between Great Britain and France which would have forced the latter Power into the German orbit and have endangered the whole future of the former. But, as has happened before, Germany counted her chickens before they were hatched. The Kaiser made no concealment of his amazement when he found that the Entente was as solid under the Radicals as it had been under the Unionists, and that the new Government was as little disposed as the old Government to stand by and allow a friend to be bullied simply because she was a friend. Some of his Imperial Majesty's diplomatists had almost as bad a quarter of an hour for "misleading their Sovereign" when this unpleasant discovery was made, as they had at the time of the Anglo-French Agreement in April 1904, which was faithfully reported by German agents in Paris and in London as an impossibility about which Germany need give herself no further concern. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman not only recognised that a strong and

independent France was an essential condition of permanent peace in Europe, but he equally realised, as must everybody with any common sense, that Anglo-French friendship was incomplete and precarious while Anglo-Russian hostility continued, and therefore an Anglo-Russian understanding became one of his objectives. He refused to take his marching orders from the Radical Jews, who were then less predominant in the party than they are to-day, and he had the satisfaction of seeing the Anglo-Russian Agreement signed before he died. The presence of the French Prime Minister at Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's funeral was interpreted on both sides of the Channel as an eloquent testimony to the knowledge of responsible France that in honouring the memory of our late Premier, the French were honouring a valued because steadfast friend.

The "Kink"

The blind fury of the "wild men" of the Coalition against everything which makes for the strength and security of the unfortunate country which claims them as citizens prevents them from realising what is common knowledge to everybody else that the policy of the Triple Entente was no "intrigue of Liberal Imperialists" as they are pleased to pretend, but it was the policy of the pro-Boer Premier, whose memory they profess to revere, and whose principles they are by way of preaching. It was likewise the policy of Mr. Gladstone who regarded the Triple Alliance with undisguised suspicion and occasionally got into trouble for the candour of his opinions and keenly resented Conservative coquetting with the Triplice of Bismarck's invention. Mr. Gladstone consistently urged his countrymen to carry their goods to other markets and to associate themselves with France and Russia in European affairs. Now that Unionists have come round to the Gladstonian policy, so-called Gladstonians have characteristically abandoned it. The clue to their conduct, which is incomprehensible to Russia and France, is to be found in that "kink" upon which we have frequently dilated. Your self-righteous Radical is above all patriotism. He is not only the warm friend of every enemy of his country, but he is likewise the bitter enemy of her friends. His psychology is as incomprehensible as that of the Suffragettes, and he is as little to be argued with. In spite of him and his kind,

we have managed, thanks to the wise and unsleeping efforts of men in both parties, to compose our differences with France and Russia with incalculable advantages to all three Powers, to say nothing of Europe, whose peace has been saved over and over again by the loyal co-operation of the members of the Triple Entente, the fruits of which were never more conspicuous or more valuable than during recent critical months. The iconoclasts of the Coalition, who make up in noise what they lack in numbers, are literally foaming at the mouth, or we should say at the pen, because their Press is their stronghold. They are reinforced by opulent aliens, several of whom hail from the Fatherland or allied communities, paying the piper of the Coalition campaign and consequently claiming the right to call the tune. These wealthy cosmopolitans, who are flocking to this country because they are not wanted elsewhere, and cannot obtain the social recognition abroad which is unfortunately accorded too readily to money-bags here, seem to live in order to bite the hand which in a social sense has fed them.

Disloyal Jews

A CERTAIN number of disloyal Jews who infest both parties are equally active in playing Germany's game by intriguing against the Triple Entente. We say this without a particle of Anti-Semitic prejudice, because the loyal Jews, who have unreservedly and without *arrière pensée* thrown in their lot with this country, constitute a valuable element in the community. But Great Britain would be infinitely richer in everything that is worth having if those other Jews, who are really little better than German spies, returned with their money-bags to the various countries they came from. If they left their countries for their countries' good they have certainly not come here for our good. The intrigue will be exposed and defeated as on former occasions, but it is as well to emphasise its existence. If our readers carefully peruse their newspapers they will have no difficulty in detecting its sinister activity, and they will ask themselves in amazement, "Why does our unique hospitality to Jews receive such a poor return? Why do so many of the Chosen Race work for Germany against England? Does Germany accord them anything like the same treatment as we do? It can't be mere hatred of Russia—the land of Pogroms—which

accounts for their hatred of the Triple Entente, because many of the most prominent German Jews are working for a German-Russian Entente, while others are only too delighted to act as financial agents of the Russian Government in Germany." The *Jewish Chronicle* and the *Jewish World*, which have rightly shown themselves solicitous as to the political reputation of the race in this country in connection with various questions exciting public concern, would do well to expound the enigma which crosses the minds of an ever-increasing number of thinking Englishmen. What have we done that we should be persecuted by the Jews? Do we persecute them? On the contrary, we seem to be standing by and allowing them to capture power after power in this country. They would appear to aim at an *imperium in imperio*. They are not content with capturing international finance, except as a lever for fresh intrigue in international relations, and they always give a casting vote for Germany. As we have seen, the theory of the Russian legend breaks down because the Jews of Germany are working to detach Russia from England and to draw Russia towards Germany, so we see that that Power's treatment of their compatriots counts for practically nothing where German interests are concerned. It only counts where British interests are concerned and when there is an opportunity of injuring England for the benefit of Germany.

"Poor Dear Germany"

THAT German efforts to undermine the Dual Alliance between France and Russia have failed is signally shown by recent events. That German bluster no longer intimidates *les nations amies et alliées* is all to the good. Englishmen have now to do their part in seeing that German blandishments in London are equally bootless. The Triple Entente occupies a triumphant position as a result of the self-restraint, prudence, and steadfastness with which the three Powers have supported one another at successive crises, and though their respective Foreign Ministers may have had to undergo the fire of domestic criticism, to any one capable of seeing the situation steadily and seeing it whole, Frenchmen, Russians, and Englishmen have every reason to congratulate themselves on the course of events. If proof were needed it may be found in the pained and pathetic cry of "Poor dear Germany," which is once

again on the lips of our precious Potsdam Party, though no single German in Germany regards either himself or his country as an object of pity and sympathy. The German Empire as a nation of patriots trained to arms is perfectly able to take care of herself, and were she aware of the whining propaganda carried on on her behalf in a foreign country by ostensible friends we are convinced that self-respecting Germans, who greatly outnumber the rest, would resent it as much as we do. Germany is the predominant partner in one of the most powerful military and naval combinations ever organised, each member of which is straining her resources so as to be able to put her maximum strength into the field or on the sea whenever "the great day," nightly prayed for by German patriots, may dawn. Moreover, the Triple Alliance has been prematurely renewed in order to emphasise the common policy at this juncture, and both Austria and Italy have been tempted down the inclined plane of "Dreadnoughts" in order that they may share with Germany the cost of driving Britain from the seas, and of making the Mediterranean a replica of the North Sea. Austria-Hungary has spent at least forty million pounds on mobilisation, and Germany is making the most frantic preparations ever made in peace-time by land and by sea with the double object of maintaining and enlarging her military supremacy, while simultaneously capturing Neptune's Trident, which, as we know on the authority of the German Emperor himself, "must be in our fist," *i.e.* the German fist. If Germany can convert a doubt into a certainty she will naturally do it and in pursuance of her objectives, after vainly trying to break up the Triple Entente by scarcely veiled ultimatums to Russia and constant menaces to France, she is now taking a turn at us by professing *urbi et orbi* that the mainspring of her existence is love of England. Grand Admiral Tirpitz, of all men perhaps the most rancorous Anglophobe in Germany, is alleged to have said something or other in the Committee of the Reichstag—the incident is still shrouded in mystery so that one interpretation may be given abroad and another at home—which is to be exploited by our Potsdam Party and our Potsdam Press as a pretext for automatically transferring Neptune's Trident to the "mailed fist" without even putting up a fight.

It is not the first of such episodes, which usually occur during the annual controversy over British Naval Estimates between the big party of the Little Navy and the little party of the Big Navy in the Cabinet. They afford a welcome pretext to the Fishers and Churchills for shirking plain duties and throwing dust in the eyes of the public, to say nothing of fresh capital to our poverty-stricken pro-German Press. We can all remember the notorious letter of the German Emperor to the late Lord Tweedmouth, then First Lord of the Admiralty, calling attention to the overwhelming preponderance of the British over the German Navy and the consequent futility of our laying down further battleships. That occurred, if we remember right, in 1908, when Great Britain laid down two "Dreadnoughts" to Germany's four, thus abandoning the two-power standard in favour of a half-power standard, and we have never recovered from this criminal folly. Needless to say, the country was told that the German Emperor's letter had no effect on British Naval Estimates which were already fixed before that document arrived. We are accustomed to such statements and may take as little of them or as much of them as we like. Perish the thought that German cajolery should exercise any influence on our patriotic statesmen. Nevertheless Grand Admiral Tirpitz's "demonstration," whatever it was, is being eagerly grasped at as a further pretext for further negligence, though it might have been imagined that enough had been done to facilitate Germany's task of conquering the supremacy of the seas by British First Lords without any additional assistance. The sorry story of Mr. Churchill's administration of our unfortunate Navy is set forth elsewhere, so that all who run may read. And so long as his speeches are taken as adequate substitutes for ships by Unionist newspapers, we entertain no expectation of any improvement at the Admiralty, which from all we hear is as unready for war to-day as was the War Office on the eve of the South African War. All the "reorganisation," of which we have heard so much, is mere "eye-wash," and the vaunted strategic department which elevated Mr. Churchill to the rank of a St. Vincent merely consists of a handful of officers who are allowed to be neither seen nor heard. A Fisher autocracy has been replaced by a Churchill-cum-Fisher autocracy, and the last state of things is worse than the first.

Darkness before Dawn

As regards the Army the Government is in a more hopeless frame of mind than ever, as may be gathered from the deplorable performances of Lords Crewe and Herschell in the House of Lords when Lord Midleton and other peers tried to recall them to realities staring them in the face. Meanwhile Lord Roberts pursues his splendid mission of patriotism, while public men generally look on in the hope that something may turn up and optimists console themselves with the reflection that it is always darkest before dawn.

President Poincaré

AMID the gloom which appears to have settled down upon this country, and which is only relieved by the occasional appearance of a German airship, which doubtless indicates the amiable intention of the German Government to destroy our dockyards and arsenals by bombs at the ripe moment, it is more refreshing to observe the attitude of our friends of the Triple Entente. Let us hope that if there is not sufficient spontaneous patriotism in this country to rise to the occasion, if we are so submerged by slimy cosmopolitanism and decadent pacifist propaganda, we may yet be shamed into motion by the bright example of others. If England is going backwards France, at any rate, is going forwards, and the Poincaré Presidency signalises the new era in which France has, so to speak, found herself. The President struck the keynote in his message to Parliament which was read in the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies on February 20. It is a long time since any Parliamentary statesman has spoken so directly to the purpose, and our anæmic and neurotic politicians are naturally trembling in their shoes while the Cobdenite-cum-Cocoa Press are weeping and wailing because, forsooth, the head of the French State is prepared to see the world as it is and refuses to cultivate those childish illusions in which men of light and leading on our side of the Channel live and move and have their being. After referring to the peaceful and normal surrender of the Presidential powers as demonstrating afresh the immovable strength of French institutions, while affording fresh proof of the vitality of the Republic and France's devotion to the ways of liberty, M. Poincaré pledged himself to make it a point of honour to defend the Constitution, the

guardianship of which had been entrusted to him for seven years.

When France was interrogated after the cruel trials of 1870 she considered that a great democracy ought to remain sole mistress of her destinies, and that the free speech of the parliamentary régime was henceforth for our nation, the indispensable guarantee of methodical and ordered progress. France was not mistaken, and the Constitution which she gave herself has secured a long period of tranquillity and of work which she is determined not to allow to be interrupted. The prerogatives of Parliament are easily reconciled with the rights and uses of the Government, and the restriction of the executive power is desired neither by the Chambers nor by the country. Without a firm and clear-sighted executive power, the proper working of the administrative services would soon run the risk of being compromised, and at certain moments public peace itself might be threatened.

After this admirable exposition of the French Constitution the President declared that during his Magistracy he should see to it

in harmony with the responsible Ministers, that the Government of the Republic maintains intact, under the control of Parliament, the authority which ought to belong to it. It is the part of the Government to be a guide and a counsellor for opinion in grave moments It is for the Government to make a rational choice amid conflicting interests, to distinguish the general from the particular and the permanent from the accidental, and to endeavour, in every new idea, to sever what is stillborn from that which is living and fruitful promise for the future

Peace and War

THE new President proceeded to review the achievements of the Third Republic and presented an impressive account of its stewardship. But the part of his message which attracted most attention at home and abroad was that in which, after declaring that, in order to fulfil its task the Republic must firmly maintain order at home, jealously watch over the balance of its budgets and the soundness of its financial resources and assure the blessings of peace abroad, M. Poincaré reminded the Republic that

Peace cannot be decreed by the will of a single Power, and never was the ancient adage more true than to day, "It is impossible for a people to be effectually pacific except by being always ready for war" A diminished France, a France exposed by her own fault to challenge or humiliation, would no longer be France; it would be a crime against civilisation to allow our country to sink in the midst of so many nations which are unceasingly developing their military strength

When shall we hear this elementary truth proclaimed from

the lips of so-called responsible statesmen in this country, who appear to have completely lost all grip of the international situation and regard Europe as one gigantic Sunday School, exclusively guided by copy-book maxims. The French President continued:

Our Army and our Navy are daily giving us proofs of their devotion and of their valour. Let our vigilant attention be turned towards them, and let us shun no effort and no sacrifice to consolidate and strengthen them. In their silent work they are the most effective auxiliaries of our diplomacy. The better armed and the more resolute we are known to be, the better chance will our words of peace and of humanity have of being listened to. For several months past we have been working with all Europe in order to avert the perils of a formidable crisis. Strong in the confidence of Parliament and of the country, sure of the fidelity of its Allies and of its friends, the Government of the Republic will prosecute with patience a policy of frankness, of wisdom, and of firmness. In the service of this policy, in the maintenance of its uniformity, in the future I shall unswervingly employ my whole energy.

This declaration has the right ring about it, and contributes more to the cause of peace than all the terrible twaddle ostensibly uttered on its behalf by the professional advocates of peace at any price. It has given immense satisfaction to all genuine friends of peace in Europe, and has made the best possible impression in Russia, and in that large part of England beyond the dominion of the Cocoa Quakers and the many undesirable aliens working in the interests of Germany. Among other significant and hopeful auguries was the exceptionally cordial telegram of the Tsar congratulating M. Poincaré on his assumption of the Presidency which is a new token of the solidarity of the Dual Alliance.

The Tsar's Congratulations

THE Emperor of Russia's message was as follows: "At the moment when you enter upon the exercise of the high functions to which the French people has called you, I feel that I must renew the assurance of the friendly sentiments which I expressed to you on the day of your election to the Presidency. You know the value which I attach to the close union that exists between France and Russia. Counting upon your aid in maintaining this union and making it prosper, I address to you my most sincere and most cordial wishes." Among other gratifying announcements is the news that M. Delcassé is to be appointed French Ambassador in Russia, which means that one of the cleverest brains in Europe

will henceforward be devoted to the task of preserving the policy with which his name is imperishably associated, and of which the Dual Alliance forms the corner-stone. Another sign of the revival of France which offers another painful contrast to our own performances is the gravity with which the Republican Government regards the further prodigious military preparations upon which Germany is embarking with a view of cowing her neighbours and dominating Europe. It is not yet known precisely what form the French reply will take, but it is certain that whatever sacrifices —and they must be great—which the nation will be called upon to make will be made, just as we believe that if we had a manly Government in this country, with the courage to tell the truth as to what Germany is doing instead of trying to conceal it by a cloud of verbiage, our people would be equally ready to respond, and if they didn't the catastrophe would at any rate be on their heads. Germany's game of trying to break up the Triple Entente, by threatening France and Russia and blarneying us officially, while the inspired German Press is instructed to heap more odium upon us than ever, is so obvious that it ought not to impose on a child in arms. But then unfortunately the "great wise and eminent gentlemen," who by virtue of reclining on Front Benches regard themselves as statesmen, are more hopeless than children in arms because even when they know the truth, as many of them do, they dare not tell it to the country which they have wilfully misled, in season and out of season, by their silly patter about peace when there can be no peace, and their hypocritical tributes to the great Christian brotherhood of nations, of which we and Germany form an integral part. We know that they are humbugs, and they know that they are humbugs—indeed, humbug is a second nature with them—but unfortunately the people believe enough of this humbug to make it difficult to tell them the whole truth, which is discounted as the invention of Jingoes, alarmists, scaremongers, &c. But when they are among themselves there is probably no collection of men who are so thoroughly scared by the position into which they have allowed themselves to drift through laziness, supineness, ignorance, and cowardice than Mr. Asquith and his colleagues, who are as eminently fitted to run an Empire on the rocks as Louis Napoleon and his advisers in 1870.

LARGELY on account of the supposed and, we believe, purely imaginary prejudices of Lancashire the Unionist Party threw overboard the food duties forming an integral part of its "first constructive work," thereby indefinitely postponing the policy of Imperial Preference and jeopardising a considerable number of Unionist seats in the South and West of England, where the whole policy is accepted and approved. No one attempted to defend this action on its merits. It was pure tactics, or rather panic, and unless the end justifies the means nothing justifies it. We are not yet in a position to form a final opinion upon the effect of this disastrous development, but recent utterances of prominent Unionists who have never displayed excessive enthusiasm for Preference indicate some misgivings as to the practicability of dividing up Tariff Reform into water-tight compartments labelled respectively "industrial" and "agricultural," one of which is to come into immediate operation in the event of a Unionist victory at the polls, while the other is to run the gauntlet of another General Election—to the detriment, as we believe, if not the destruction, of both branches of our policy. Lancashire, according to Cobdenites, will think the day after to-morrow what the rest of the civilised world thought the day before yesterday. This tremendous sacrifice has been made largely to placate Lancashire, but the attitude of the County Palatine is not precisely illuminating nor we should imagine encouraging to the engineers of the latest free food intrigue. There have been two by-elections in Lancashire during the last three months, one at Bolton in November, when the Unionist Party was staggering under the impossible burden of the so-called "Food taxes"—which, by the way, are not taxes because they are duties imposed on produce tax-free so far as the Home and Imperial supply are concerned. Nevertheless, at Bolton, in spite of singularly adverse circumstances, we managed to decrease the Radical majority by nearly 500 votes. At about the same time an out-and-out Tariff Reformer captured Bow and Bromley from so popular a Socialist as Mr. George Lansbury, converting the Socialist majority of 863 into a Unionist majority of 751. It is true that Mr. Lansbury was handicapped by the hysterical support of Suffragists and Suffra-

Bolton

gettes, but it might have been expected that the "dear food bogey" would have completely outweighed such a burden in a poverty stricken East-end constituency.

Now we have another Lancashire by-election at Chorley, where a vacancy has arisen through the death of that remarkable man Lord Crawford, which involves the regrettable departure of Lord Balcarres, the Chief Whip of the Unionist Party in the House of Commons—and the best Whip we have had in our time. He has rendered conspicuous service to Unionism, for besides being a man of exceptional ability and untiring industry and devotion, he is endowed with splendid pugnacity and is free from the foibles of the Mandarin and that fatality—the superior person. Lord Balcarres understands that in order to win you must fight all the time, and he has been the means of imperilling the Government on many occasions. Like the rest of his colleagues in the Opposition Whips' room in the House of Commons, Lord Balcarres was a Die-Hard in the crisis on the Parliament Bill, and his father's name is to be found on the roll of honour containing the peers who followed Lord Halsbury against the two Front Benches on that fateful 10th of August 1911. The enforced retirement of active and able politicians from the House of Commons to a House of Lords that has deliberately emasculated itself is a cruel hardship which cannot long endure, and whenever there is a serious reform of the Second Chamber this injustice must disappear. As we have already seen, the Unionists, in spite of "food taxes," reduced the Radical majority at Bolton by nearly 500 votes. Lord Balcarres held Chorley by the magnificent majority of 2500 in December 1910 as a whole-hogger carrying the same accursed burden of "food taxes." If there were any foundation for the recent panic and abandonment of the food duties Chorley would have revealed it. Indeed, after what we were told it would scarcely have been surprising to secure a free-food majority of at least 5000, all the more as we had the best possible candidate in Sir Henry Hibbert, whose services were enlisted as the wire-pullers were uneasy as to the popularity of an unalloyed policy of free food. We feel intensely relieved that Unionism has done no worse. Sir Henry Hibbert has succeeded in keeping Chorley by nearly

Chorley

2000 votes, and Lord Balcarres' majority has only fallen by about 500. In other words, when saddled with those terrible "food taxes" we reduced the Radical majority at Bolton by nearly 500. Minus the "food taxes" our majority at Chorley has been reduced by the Radicals by over 500. This augurs ill for the sweeping of Lancashire which we were promised if we would consent to half-mast the Imperial flag. As the defeated Radical candidate has been at pains to point out, this is the first by-election since the General Election at which a Unionist majority has been reduced.

The Lancashire Legend

THE truth about the Lancashire panic is gradually leaking out. It appears to have been, like all other panics, a combination of stupidity and cowardice for which there is no vestige of an excuse. It was not a poor man's panic. The masses were not in revolt against "dear food." They have had a sufficient taste of "dear food" under Cobdenism, and were perfectly willing to try an experiment in Protection. It was a rich man's panic disfigured by disagreeable incidents—for example, the dismissal of Tariff Reform editors in order that a "spontaneous" demonstration might be made against the Chamberlain policy in the North as well as in the South of Lancashire. It was a superficial movement of thoughtless, interested parties of a naturally timorous disposition, who cherish the fond illusion that the country exists mainly for the purpose of providing them with high office and who persuaded themselves in their ignorance that their own apprehensions about "food taxes" were shared by Lancashire working men. It was an elaborately organised intrigue on the part of the Bigwigs of the Unionist Party in Lancashire, who communicated their alarm to Lancashire Members of Parliament, who lost their heads and stampeded the Party with the aid of certain Irish Unionists, who should under all circumstances resolutely resist stampedes. The maintenance of the Union depends upon the uncompromising steadfastness of Ulster, and it is not for Ulstermen to encourage Unionists to abandon any of their principles, because surrender is the most catching of all political diseases just as it is the most demoralising. Unless we are careful we shall witness a similar effort at the crisis of the Union; to be forewarned is to be forearmed. Those who

have scuttled before an imaginary Lancashire are equally capable of scuttling before an imaginary Ireland. We shall always regret that Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Bonar Law did not adhere to their original intention of summoning a Party meeting and bidding adieu to the Fainthearts. We must now all do what we can to retrieve the position, but we can only retrieve it by looking the facts frankly in the face and by realising exactly what has been done and what must be undone. At Chorley as at every other by-election since the postponement of the policy of practical Preference—and the Radicals will repeat the tactics in every constituency—the Ureite party insisted on having it both ways after the manner of the Lord Advocate of Scotland—the modern George Washington. Radical speakers and Radical newspapers told the agricultural part of the electorate that agriculture would suffer from one-sided Tariff Reform, which meant that many things needed by farmers and labourers would be taxed, while by no possibility could they benefit, as every agricultural product was to be rigidly excluded from the tariff, at any rate for the purposes of the next General Election. On the other hand, townsmen were told that the postponement of the food duties was a mere electioneering dodge, and that if they once allowed themselves to become entangled in any form of Protection food would be taxed like everything else and they would find themselves reduced to living on black bread and offal, &c.

Worst of both Worlds

THUS, while the Radicals have the best of both worlds, we are to have the worst of both worlds, and those responsible for Unionist policy must consider very carefully as to the best way of meeting this double attack, which will be all the more effective because we have undoubtedly suffered an appreciable amount of "moral and intellectual damage" by the mere fact of appearing to abandon a policy, or to water down a policy, which has been so long in the forefront of the Unionist programme, and which undoubtedly forms the chief tie between a large percentage of the electorate of progressive proclivities and the Party they have temporarily supported in the belief that its victory would involve the entire policy of Tariff Reform in which they believe. That is our answer to those who, as we think, misjudge public

opinion—though we have never laid any claim to infallibility—and sincerely, though erroneously, believe that the Union, the Church, the House of Lords, and every other cause for which Unionism stands is jeopardised by its association with Tariff Reform, the real truth being that the condition of a great mass of the people as revealed by all available evidence, and in spite of any inflation of statistics, is so bad and so hopeless that they are prepared to vote Unionist in order to get rid of that damnable sweating system miscalled Free Trade. If this view be right, as we believe it is, so far from helping other Conservative causes by shelving Tariff Reform we are imperilling one and all. Those who believe as we do in the whole policy must continue preaching the whole policy, and we do not despair if we are sufficiently energetic and determined of convincing the Party that the bisection of Tariff Reform and two General Elections spells disaster. We would earnestly appeal to those Unionist newspapers who do not agree with us upon this question to institute their own independent enquiries, which to be of any use must be conducted by men whose sole object is to get at the truth and who are not animated by mere hostility to Tariff Reform. We are sure they will find if they turn their attention to Lancashire, for instance, that the Lancashire working man is far too intelligent to be scared by the food bogey and that the recent stampede in Lancashire was exclusively the handiwork of a few men in the upper middle-classes who took their orders from one or two Lancashire Bigwigs. The Imperial side of Tariff Reform makes no less an irresistible appeal to the men of Lancashire than it does to the men of Kent—or to the *men* of any place.

The New Chief Whip

THE post of Chief Opposition Whip is, perhaps, the most important and difficult position in the Unionist Party after the Leadership, and there was considerable curiosity as to how Mr. Bonar Law would fill the vacancy caused by the lamentable retirement of Lord Balcarres to "another place." Mr. Bonar Law did not take long in making up his mind. He invited Lord Edmund Talbot to accept this thankless task, an offer which was patriotically accepted. We know that it is an impertinence for any outsider to criticise any Parliamentary arrangement. We are accustomed to the question

"What can you possibly know about the House of Commons?" Nevertheless we shall venture to congratulate the party on the leader's choice, which we do not think could have been improved upon. Lord Edmund Talbot has qualities essential to a Chief Whip. He is immensely liked and respected by everybody who knows him. He has no "side," nor indeed any trace of that "hierarchical" manner which is so peculiarly exasperating in many Parliamentarians otherwise very good fellows. He also possesses courage and convictions. It is characteristic of a sinister Coalition in league with disaffected Irish Catholics, who have devoted their whole energies to injuring and humiliating this country at home and abroad, to exploit the fact that the new Opposition Whip is an English Catholic, with a view to sowing suspicion in the mind of Ulster. We warn Unionists that this is going to be worked for all it is worth and a good deal more. Speaking as Protestants among Protestants we would remind Ulstermen that Lord Edmund Talbot was an uncompromising Die-Hard during the crisis over the Parliament Bill in 1911, and had he been a peer he would have fought in the last ditch with his brother the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Halsbury. Certain prominent Ulster peers of unimpeachable Protestantism who ought to have known better joined in the general stampede which enabled the Parliament Bill to be placed on the Statute Book, while the Anglican bishops, with a few honourable exceptions, made themselves *participes criminis* by voting for that infamous measure which was openly and avowedly declared by its authors to be the precursor of the present preposterous Home Rule Bill. We are more firmly than ever of opinion that had the Die-Hard cause triumphed in 1911 there would have been no Home Rule Bill in 1912, because even if the threatened creation of peers was not all bluff, as we incline to believe, the attempt to carry it out would have caused the collapse of the Government. For this very simple reason: Had the new creations been taken from outside Parliament there would have been a revolt of the Radical Plutocracy inside the House of Commons, which would have brought down the Government. On the other hand, if any large number of Radical Members of Parliament had been made hereditary peers, Unionists would have enjoyed the unique advantage of something approaching a General Election without any possibility of losing any seats, while the circumstances

would have provided golden opportunities of capturing Radical strongholds.

House of Lords

When the inner history of the Die-Hard movement comes to be written, as is bound to happen before very long, the truth at which we have frequently hinted in these pages will be confirmed, namely that Mr. Balfour was rushed off his legs by impetuous scuttlers and yielded against his better judgment, emphasising his detachment by going abroad on the very day of the fatal division in the House of Lords. We feel sure that Irish Unionists will have no reason to regret the selection of Lord Edmund Talbot as Chief Whip of the Unionist Party, and that on a calm review of the situation they will agree that the Catholic aristocracy of England, who were solid almost to a man with Lord Halsbury, have a much better record than some of the mugwumps and Mandarins of the Anglican communion, and are far more entitled to public confidence on this issue. Having voluntarily surrendered their time-honoured power of preventing Governments from passing outrageous measures for which they had no popular authority behind the backs of and against the wishes of the people, the House of Lords to-day presents a somewhat pathetic spectacle. Under the Parliament Bill political power in this country is concentrated in the hands of a "Single Self-paid Chamber," which is content to register the successive decrees of a Coalition Caucus held together by the "cohesive power of public plunder." There is plenty of discussion in the House of Lords, and the standard of debate, at any rate among Unionist peers, remains as high as ever—even if Lord Crewe and his crew cut a pitiable figure—but it is impossible to interest the public in these debates because the peers have little more power than the Debating Society of Upper Tooting. When no serious effect can be given to speeches, even if the speeches are worthy of the classic period of Athenian eloquence, speeches cease to interest.

The Commons

In the House of Commons, on the other hand, there is little or no discussion as that word is generally understood, but plenary powers. It is true that there are stereotyped debates frequently distinguished by excellent speeches both in substance and in form, but the speeches count no more than those in the House of Lords, because

everybody knows that under the guillotine the question will be decided in the Division Lobby at a certain hour by members who have not heard the debate, and as the Coalition commands a majority of over 100, there is little room for doubt as to the issue even though by splendid zeal and admirable efficiency the Government may occasionally be scored off in a so-called "snap division." But even when Ministers are defeated it makes no difference. They are there for the purpose of eating dirt, and dirt they will continue to eat. "Resign" is not a word known to their vocabulary. When out-manœuvred under the rules of the parliamentary game they merely break the rules and go on as if nothing had happened. Parliamentary pundits who like to imagine that the Mother of Parliaments is still the envy and admiration of surrounding nations, may shake their heads and imagine that condign punishment must fall upon the iconoclasts of the Treasury Bench, but the mass of the nation is not even aware that there has been an "incident." The general effect of the Asquith régime has been to kill public interest in the House of Commons, though the authors of the Parliament Act not unnaturally imagined that by bluffing the Peers into surrendering to the Commons the latter would become the cynosure of all eyes. It would be highly interesting, if it were feasible, to poll the readers of those newspapers which still pay the Legislature the compliment of reporting its proceedings at length, with a view to ascertaining how many even glance at these serried and repellent columns contributed by one House that discusses without power and another that has power without discussion. We believe that such a poll would be a revelation. Personally we cannot help feeling some gratitude for the Parliament Act, because whereas one used to wear out one's eyes over "Parliamentary Intelligence" one has become conscious of the futility of it all and naturally turns to the more interesting parts of the great papers.

Home Rule

After this somewhat heterodox confession our readers may be disinclined for epitomes of Parliamentary Debates, and on the whole we have let them off cheaply in this respect of late. The House of Lords did what little it could with the Home Rule Bill by rejecting it on second reading by a majority of 257 (326–69) as compared with the majority of 378 (419–41) by which Mr. Gladstone's last Home

Rule Bill was rejected in 1893. Superficial persons have attempted to argue from these figures that British feeling against Home Rule is slackening, but this is an erroneous inference. The figures merely serve to show a slackening of interest on the part of the peerage in the artificial proceedings of an assembly shorn of powers possessed by every serious Second Chamber in the civilised world. There was naturally great excitement and a great muster of peers in 1893 because they all knew that their vote would contribute to kill a dangerous Bill. But there was naturally little excitement and a much smaller attendance on the present occasion because the peers knew that they could only postpone the evil day by hanging up the measure for a year and a half, and many of them felt it was hardly worth turning out for this. People who are not precisely fools thought there was something to be said in favour of the Lords letting this grotesque measure through, bringing the crisis to a head and forcing upon the present Government the responsibility of endeavouring to set up a Molly Maguire tyranny over Ulster rather than cast on their successors the odious tasks inseparable from this Bill. But those were probably wise who decided that such a policy was liable to misunderstanding in Ulster and the United Kingdom generally. It should be added that there is a widespread belief that a General Election must precede any attempt to bring into operation an impossible measure which will satisfy no one, settle nothing, and provoke civil war. There may be good grounds for this optimism, but in spite of diligent research we have been unable to discover them. As we have said so often before, the issue lies in the hands of Ulster, and if she has the requisite energy and grit she will succeed in destroying once and for all the detestable conspiracy (which has now lasted for an entire generation) to dismember the United Kingdom. Ulster can lead England, Ulster can drive England. That other small nationalities have done so is shown by the current *mot* which may be familiar to some of our readers: "What is England? England is an island in the German Ocean, governed by Scotsmen, kicked by Irishmen, and plundered by Welshmen."

The Bull Mouse Party

The Bull Mouse Party, as the Coalition has been wittily christened by a distinguished member of our profession, has suffered several nasty jars in the process of forcing through the House of Commons the meanest of its many despicable measures—the Welsh Church Bill. It takes a great deal to turn the stomach of a Radical against any item in the Ministerial menu, but the repulsive attitude of the Government towards one of the few civilising influences in Wales was more than some of their English supporters could endure, and young Mr. Gladstone (the grandson of the Grand Old Man) in particular distinguished himself by his independence and firmness in refusing to be browbeaten by the Bull Mouse Caucus. We trust that this promising young man may be equally resolute in resisting their blandishments and will refuse to become incorporated in the Bull Mouse machine. The devoted Churchmen of the Unionist Party led the attack with conspicuous ability and enthusiasm, among the younger members who were foremost in the fray being Lord Wolmer and Mr. Ormsby Gore, while Lord Hugh Cecil more than once spoke with such eloquence as momentarily to melt the heart of bitter Dissenters even though he could not detach a vote, while Lord Robert Cecil was in his own inimitable way equally efficacious, and other Unionist Churchmen proved their devotion in this great struggle. They would, however, do well to remember the unfaltering support they received from Unionist Nonconformists and other sections of the Party, who though not regarding the maintenance of the Established Church in Wales as the most important of issues are nevertheless prepared to follow their lead in resisting it, and without the support of the former the latter would have been powerless. It is not unnaturally a disappointment to some of them to find that Churchmen are prepared to use the position cheerfully and unreservedly accorded to them in their admirable campaign against the destruction and spoliation of a noble institution, to persuade the Unionist leaders to discard other elements in Unionist policy which are rightly regarded as of vital importance by other equally important sections of the Party. Such log-rolling as forms the basis of the Coalition is odious, and no one desires to see its importation into our Party, but there must be a little give and take in all effective parties, and those who try to take all without giving anything in

return will find themselves and everything they hold dear overtaken in a common ruin.

Coming Revival

We may fairly claim to speak with impartiality on this question because in any event we should uphold the Welsh Church with the same zeal that we uphold the Union or preach Tariff Reform. There are, however, many Tariff Reformers who could not say as much, but who have nevertheless unswervingly followed the Party only to find their own cause cold-shouldered. If the Church and the Union are to be associated in the minds of the working classes with Cobdenism both will infallibly perish. The emigration figures are decisive on this point. If conditions were satisfactory in Free Trade England there would not be a stampede of the cream of the working classes, industrial and agricultural, to Protectionist countries. The Unionist Party have fought the meanest Bill with splendid zeal, and over and over again the Bull Mouse Government were only saved from catastrophe by the godless Molly Maguires who would destroy anything in order to be able to work their wicked will in Ireland and to wreak their long-deferred vengeance upon Irish Loyalists. The House of Lords has given us a temporary respite from the Meanest Bill by rejecting its second reading by a majority of 201 (252–51). The Bull Mouse Party are now feverishly arranging to start another session as soon as the present session has closed in order that the Home Rule Bill and the Meanest Bill may be hustled through the House of Commons undiscussed—while " mum's the word " in the country—so that these scandalous measures may be again sent up to the House of Lords so as to enable them to become law under the Parliament Act before the country has an opportunity of being consulted. The House of Lords is full of parliamentary ability and eloquence, and we trust that late in the day though it be there is sufficient grit in our Second Chamber to meet the Bull Mouse Party in the gate. It must not be forgotten, in spite of all that has happened, that the peers retain in their arsenal weapons capable of destroying the Government, and the choice before the House of Lords is to use those weapons and destroy the Government, or alternatively to allow the Government to complete the destruction of the Constitution besides destroying

the country. We have been publicly given to understand on more than one occasion that our only Second Chamber will not quail from discharging the duty before it; and unless it is prepared to die with ignominy, the time is at hand for a display of nerve. We are on the eve of great events, of which the greatest will be a notable reaction against every form of scuttling, and a revival of real Unionism founded on strength of purpose.

Coalition Ethics

WE have no desire to deluge our readers with the Marconi question. An article by the Editor will be found elsewhere following the Special Report of the Marconi Committee, which is reproduced *in extenso*, as we think it will be found interesting all over the world, especially by those who have not had the opportunity of reading the ample reports of the proceedings which have appeared in many British newspapers, including one Radical paper the *Manchester Guardian*. Nor is it necessary for us to enlarge on this topic, as it has been so fully dealt with by the Press, and the canons of editorial duty, in scrupulously observing the confidences of those who have relied upon editorial discretion, have been admirably laid down in innumerable organs. Indeed, so far as we have observed, this elementary axiom is universally recognised outside the atrabilious mouthpieces of the Coalition, which perhaps, in their incoherent fury, scarcely know what they are writing and printing and certainly cannot mean what they say, for if they were serious their readers would infer that no correspondent would be safe in making a private communication, written or verbal, to Coaliton editors as, *ex hypothesi*, these might at any moment, on the demand of a Select Committee or on some other equally frivolous pretext, divulge the name of their confidant as well as the contents of any private letter, to the public, including vindictive political enemies. If such be in fact the ethics of Radical journalism Radical editors are unlikely to be overwhelmed with correspondence in the future—to the detriment of the Post Office—as their readers will naturally be apprehensive of betrayal. Is it safe, one may ask, to write an anonymous letter to a Coalition journal if one's name is liable to be handed over to whatever may be the Star Chamber of the moment? We do not imagine that any serious editor,

however "advanced" his politics, assents to this novel doctrine, but it is difficult to draw any other inference from articles recently published in papers purporting to be serious. England, as we know, does not love Coalitions. She will speedily cease to love the Coalition Press.

Valuable Tips

It is always as well to know where one is, and one cannot help being grateful for the abundant information vouchsafed by our friends the enemy as to what could and would happen when the Marconi Committee "reported" the editor of the *National Review* to the Speaker of the House of Commons for refusing to give up the names of private correspondents and others with whom he had discussed the Marconi question. The *Manchester Guardian* was as full of knowledge as an egg is full of meat, and its "political correspondent" at Westminster was in a position to announce in advance the precise course of events on the 13th of February, the day after the action of the Marconi Committee. But he was not even correct to a Session, as he imagined that the Chairman, Sir Albert Spicer, would formally report the resolution of the Committee "one day," "which will probably be early next Session." Whereupon, according to the *Manchester Guardian*, "the Prime Minister as Leader of the House will move that Mr. Maxse be ordered to attend at the Bar of the House on the day following. Such an order is issued by the Clerk of the House and served personally on the witness in question. Later Mr. Maxse will be called to the Bar. He may then, should the facts appear to the House as they did to the Committee, either apologise for his refusal to accede to the request of the Committee, in which case the precedents would appear to point to the incident being closed by a reprimand from the Speaker and a promise that the required document be forthcoming, or he may persist in the position he has taken up before the Committee." Our instructive contemporary added, "In the latter case the House, if it should decide to inflict any punishment, may take one of three courses:

(1) It may commit him to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms. This course has been generally reserved for members;

(2) It may impose a fine;

(3) It may commit him to prison—of course in the First Division."*

We cannot resist expressing our abiding gratitude to our considerate contemporary for conceding "the First Division," because if the *Manchester Guardian* takes its own articles seriously it should stand out for the last division in the case of such a criminal. Its political expert added that "imprisonment cannot last longer than the date of prorogation, it being in the power of any one so imprisoned to obtain release immediately Parliament had been prorogued by a writ of *habeas corpus*." We further learn that "the power under which the House acts in this case is contained in the Sessional Orders—a series of resolutions reaffirmed at the commencement of each Session." Then follows the usual quotation from Erskine May: "The House has acted on these resolutions with severity, and the journals abound with cases in which witnesses have been punished by committal to the Sergeant-at-Arms, to Newgate, or to the Tower, for prevaricating or giving false testimony for suppressing the truth or refusing to answer questions, or to produce documents in their possession." (Erskine May, ed. 1906, p. 75.)

"The Fat Boy"

So there is no longer room for any lingering doubt as to what *Manchester Guardian* government means. We are further reminded that "the case is of some importance, inasmuch as the whole utility of Select Committees would be imperilled if their powers of calling for 'persons, papers, and records' were not preserved. There appears to be no recent precedent for this present case. A witness who refused to attend the Select Committee on Money Lending was arrested, brought to the Bar, and thereupon tendered an apology to the House." The *Daily Chronicle* was even more successful in making one's flesh creep, as the "Fat Boy," or whoever the gentleman may be who does "The Office Window" of that newspaper, while differing from the *Manchester Guardian* as to the particular Session when the execution would take place, wrote as follows (*see Daily Chronicle*, February 13): "The fate in store for Mr. Maxse to-day (should the Commons decide to summon him to the Bar of the House) is foreshadowed in the awful words of Mr. Palgrave, who long ago described the scene

when an unwilling witness stood for judgment. 'By him stands the Sergeant-at-Arms holding up in air the sceptre of gilded silver that is called the mace. In the far distance at the end of the great hall sits the Speaker; in solemn tones he questions the offender; so frightened indeed was one poor fellow that he fell on the floor of the House in a convulsive fit.'" The *Daily Chronicle* adds, and one is tempted to ask in passing whether this sorry stuff is not a breach of Parliamentary privilege, as tending to cast ridicule on the House of Commons, "One can almost believe it when we are told that Speaker Abbott used to send his victim away with these words ringing on his tympanum: 'Because you have, in defiance of the laws of this country, knowingly and wilfully violated at once the privileges of this House and the just constitution of Parliament, you are committed to the gaol of Newgate, the common receptacle of malefactors, there to remain a prisoner, a signal proof of the power and justice of this House, an indelible disgrace to you, and a memorable example to others.'" The *Daily News* of the same date fixed yet another time for the drama, and after announcing that "the attacks made on individual Ministers have been of a very gross description, and feeling on the subject runs high throughout the Coalition," pointed out that "a warrant could be issued for the seizure of all correspondence connected with the *National Review*." Other cocoa organs were equally illuminating, and Captain Cocoa's organ, the *Star*, consigned the present writer to "the dock," a subject on which the *Star* may have special knowledge denied to less favoured mortals.

The Times Leader

MEANWHILE our leading journal, the *Times*, putting aside all personal questions, which are entirely immaterial in an issue of this character, published a leading article on the same day as "the heathen raged furiously together," entitled "A Question of Privilege," which laid down the law as understood and practised by all self-respecting journalists throughout the civilised world. After describing what had occurred before the Committee the *Times* was careful to disclaim all responsibility for the rumours as to gambling in Marconi shares.

These rumours have had no currency in the columns of the *Times*, and we shall

continue to reserve all comment until the Committee has concluded its enquiry. Still less are we concerned with the value of the evidence offered by Mr. Maxse, or by any other individual witness. We have in view simply and solely the point of principle raised yesterday in the Committee—a point which affects every journal in the country. The position taken up by Mr. Maxse is one which it is essential to maintain, if the power of newspapers for good from time to time is not to be impaired. Much information and criticism beneficial to the public will necessarily be suppressed if those who communicate with editors are no longer assured that the confidence reposed in them will in all circumstances be respected. It is to the honour of English journalism that the implied promise given to correspondents has rarely been broken. We do not doubt that it will continue to be kept.

As the *Times* observed, "the ordinary law of privilege has been formed mainly with reference to the position of the solicitor, who is not bound to divulge information, or to disclose documents obtained by him in performing his professional duties to a client." A somewhat similar privilege, though resting upon other grounds, belongs to an official refusing to produce documents of which the disclosure would be detrimental to the public service. "But good sense and the practice of honourable men have extended privilege further than the boundaries prescribed by the lawyer's books. Many a physician has received from patients communications which under no pressure would he reveal. Many a Roman Catholic priest—and probably not a few clergymen of other faiths—have been told secrets which they would not think of disclosing so long as their silence did not further or conceal crime or fraud. Their silence, even under pressure, has been to their honour." The *Times* leader concluded as follows: "It may be somewhat difficult to explain to a Committee not acquainted with the conditions of production and working of a newspaper the necessity of respecting absolutely the confidence given to an editor by his correspondents. But it is tolerably certain that, if conceivably any members were placed in circumstances similar to those in which Mr. Maxse was yesterday, they, as honourable men, would have declined to speak. The more the point is considered . . . the clearer will it appear that the chief sufferers from breaches of the present practice would, in the long run, be the public themselves. Let us add that the definite recognition of this practice must impose a corresponding obligation on the Press to see to it that a privileged position is never abused. That is an obligation, we are confident, that the Press will readily

accept and loyally fulfil." As we have already pointed out, the readers of newspapers which contest the unimpeachable doctrine so clearly and strongly laid down by the *Times* will henceforward be chary of trusting the editors of those organs with any information or names not intended for publication if requisite pressure be brought to bear.

The Prophets at Sea

If "the intelligent anticipation of events before they occur" be the primary duty of newspapers, as was once laid down by an eminent man, the Coalition organs were sadly at sea in their gloomy vaticinations, and Members of Parliament who, at much inconvenience—especially Radical Members of Parliament—assembled in great force at Westminster on the afternoon of the 13th of February to "see the fun," have every right to resent the misinformation scattered broadcast by the feckless myrmidons of the Coalition Press. We do not feel that it would be becoming in us to make any comment on the proceedings, so we confine ourselves to reproducing the operative passage from the Official Report:

MARCONI COMMITTEE.

EVIDENCE OF MR. MAXSE.

*SIR ALBERT SPICER: I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, a question in relation to the report presented on behalf of the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company Limited Agreement, as to what action you propose to take in the matter?

MR. SPEAKER: I have read the report presented by the hon. member on behalf of the Committee, and it does not appear to me that I have to take any action—at least not to initiate any action. I shall act, of course, ministerially as spokesman of the House if the House thinks fit at any future time to take any action. But I do not think it would be according to precedent or right for me to take any action on my own initiative, and I shall wait until I am instructed by a Resolution of the House. I do not know whether the Prime Minister wishes to make any statement in regard to the matter. I think the indication should come from him as to what action he thinks the House might properly take.

* Chairman of the Marconi Committee.

THE PRIME MINISTER: Perhaps I may say that, like the majority of members, I have only had time to give a very cursory perusal to the Report of the Committee circulated this morning. I understand that the Committee has adjourned for this Session. In the circumstances, and having regard to the stage of the Session we have reached, and of the importance, as all experience shows, of proceeding in matters of this kind only after full opportunity of consideration and deliberation, I am not prepared to assume the responsibility of advising the House to take any immediate action.

* CAPTAIN MURRAY: May I ask whether the Prime Minister will consider the advisability of referring the Report to the Committee of Pivileges? (*sic*)

THE PRIME MINISTER: I do not know why I should do that. It is not a question of privilege at all.

MR. JOHN WARD: Does the right hon. gentleman think it necessary to take any further proceedings whatever relating to this case in view of the fact that the gentleman has refused to substantiate the accusations he made?

THE PRIME MINISTER: I do not think I could usefully add anything to what I have said.

The Attack on Mr. Lawson

THE circumstances being what they are, it is perhaps advisable to postpone further observations on the proceedings of the Marconi Committee, which it is alleged will be reconstituted next Session, and will resume operations precisely where they left off. At any rate, that is the suggestion of the Ministerial Press, but the Ministerial Press is so hopelessly unreliable that one never knows when to take its statements seriously. Its sense of decorum and fair play may be gathered from the daily abuse showered on Mr. W. R. Lawson while he was actually giving evidence before the Select Committee, and by the indecent glorification of those who were cross-examining. Many men admirable with their pens do not shine in the war of words at which parliamentarians are adept, just as many men who are clever with their tongues are impotent with their pens. The mud-slingers of the Coalition

* Brother of the last Chief Whip of the Radical Party, the Master of Elibank, recently created a peer.

regarded Mr. Lawson as a suitable objective, but their vituperation is unlikely to do him any harm and the treatment he received has already provoked a reaction. Mr. Lawson must be judged as a writer and not as a witness, because writing is his vocation while the other is not, and reviewing his articles in the *Outlook* and the *National Review* in the light of our present knowledge —which we owe largely to Mr. Lawson's efforts—what strikes one most is the sound instinct which prompted him to probe the Marconi mystery, and the remarkable *flaire* with which he tackled a peculiarly complicated question upon which the public had been deliberately starved of information by his Majesty's Ministers, who had a special duty to take the House of Commons and the country into their confidence directly the March "Contract" (it is the Attorney-General's word) "had been got" (we again quote the Attorney-General) by the Marconi Company. Extravagant capital has been made out of the fact that Mr. Lawson volunteered the statement that in the course of his business as a money-broker he carried over a few Marconi shares among a lot of other shares and was to that extent "a bear," on a transaction from which he made about £40. We trust that everybody concerned will be as frank and open as Mr Lawson. This trumpery affair had no more influence on his writing than a judge's holding in railway stock would have on his conduct of an action for negligence against a railway company. Directly Mr. Lawson saw that a controversy which seemed like a peculiarly forlorn hope was developing into a considerable affair he closed his trifling transactions in Marconi shares. We may perhaps venture to express the hope that the Committee will succeed in securing an exhaustive list of Marconi "bulls."

A Word with our Readers

We need only say two other words on the business. We have referred to the suggestion of the *Daily News* that the *National Review* correspondence could be seized. We trust that these and any other legends that may be propagated in order to deter our readers from communicating with us will have a precisely contrary effect. Indeed, we feel confident that nothing can interrupt the flow of confidential communications which form by far the most valuable part of an editor's correspondence, and those

who trust us in the future as they have done in the past may rest assured that under no conceivable circumstances will their trust be betrayed. Neither their names nor any names, which they may mention but desire should not be mentioned to the world, nor any statements which they wish to have treated as confidential will be given to whomsoever it may be. Nor has any one any right to suggest to our private correspondents, as is being done by some professed seekers after truth, that they should take the initiative in disclosing their identity. All such suggestions are equally calculated, with others that we have referred to, to destroy confidence between an editor and his readers, which is the most precious possession of any organ. We cannot thank personally all those who have congratulated the *National Review* on its present stand, but the number and nature of the congratulations have been most gratifying and even embarrassing. To our confrères of the Press, with some of whom we have occasionally been in sharp conflict on public questions, we desire to express our warm appreciation of the generous manner in which differences have been forgotten and of the splendid support they have given in a fight for principle, which is equally vital to the Press and the public. None of us claim any caste privilege, but simply that the decencies of civilised intercourse may be preserved and that when confidence has been given it shall not be betrayed under any temptation. Every self-respecting man, be he editor or anything else, would go to the stake for that principle.

Sensitiveness and Sense

MR. RUPERT GWYNNE, the Unionist Member for Eastbourne, is to be warmly congratulated upon the brilliant success of his persistent efforts to illuminate the curious complications of Indian finance. Ministers have all of a sudden become fearfully sensitive about their personal honour, but they remain tolerably indifferent concerning the honour of the country, and their attitude upon many questions is calculated to make their predecessors turn in their graves, while their supporters in the Press imagine that every difficulty can be disposed of by vituperating anybody and everybody who dares to call attention to any impropriety or seeming impropriety on the part of a mulish Ministry without pride of ancestry or hope of posterity. There was a time when British public men were not merely scrupulous to avoid impropriety, but they were

exceedingly sensitive as to the appearance of impropriety, realising that the good name of a statesman is a priceless asset to the community. There are still men who maintain the highest traditions and consequently inspire profound confidence in all such matters, and happily they are not confined to one party. If any lunatic suggested that Sir Edward Grey was capable of utilising his inside knowledge of Foreign Affairs to speculate in international stocks he would be forthwith presented with a strait-waistcoat. There would be nothing criminal or indictable in such action on the part of our Foreign Minister, but it would be simply impossible. Nor is this a question of class as some would like to pretend, because a similar observation would apply to such a man as Mr. John Burns, whose name could never be associated in the mind of the most suspicious of his opponents with anything that was not straightforward and honourable and of good report, nor would Mr. Burns ever knowingly put himself in an invidious position. This is not a question of personal or party prejudice. We loathe the opinions of Sir Edward Grey on every domestic question and regard him as one of the most dangerous members of the Cabinet, owing to his reputation as a Moderate. We equally detest the views of Mr. Burns, of Lord Morley of Blackburn, of Lord Loreburn and several other Ministers, who are not merely sensitive on matters of propriety—any one can be sensitive—but sensible in so comporting themselves as to prevent any whisper at their expense from ever arising. Lord Morley has devoted his political energies to the dismemberment of the United Kingdom. It would be difficult to imagine a worse political record. Lord Loreburn was perhaps the most bitter of the pro-Boers. To us his opinions are rotten and hateful. We believe him to have been one of the original Potsdam Party in the Campbell-Bannerman Cabinet. But "rumour" could never get a hearing in his case or in the case of many of his colleagues.

Mr. Rupert Gwynne's Campaign

It is therefore idle to try and pooh-pooh such questions as Mr. Rupert Gwynne, in his capacity as a Member of Parliament, has very rightly and persistently raised throughout this winter on the Silver question, and which we intend to raise directly an Oil question comes into view. Mr. Gwynne's speech in the House of Commons (February 13) should be read in its entirety. He moved

"that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the administration of Indian Finance and Currency by the Secretary of State for India and Council of India, and the responsibility and powers vested in the Finance Committee, in special relation to the recent purchases of silver and the distribution of cash balances." He rightly complained that this subject could only be raised "at a time when hon. members are worn out and anxious to get away," and he properly commented on the difficulty which had been experienced in extracting information from the India Office concerning the recent purchases of silver, declaring "that one may fairly say that the powers of prevarication which the India Office have exhibited are as fully developed as it would be possible for any Government Department to exhibit." This is saying a good deal, but Mr. Gwynne is a master of his subject, and he may be right, though perhaps if he were not protected by privilege he would be laying himself open to a libel action by some other Government Department jealous of the priority thus accorded to the India Office. Question after question had been necessary before the real facts of the case could be elicited. "A short time ago the Prime Minister resented somewhat a suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition when he stated in this House that information on this subject had to be extracted from the Government as if we were drawing teeth." As an illustration he would cite a question which he (Mr. Gwynne) had put down when they were all in the dark, asking for a copy of the contract with Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company for the purchase of silver, and a copy of the terms on which they were instructed to purchase, and this was the reply vouchsafed by Mr. Harold Baker, who, in the regrettable and we must say inexplicable absence of the Under-Secretary for India (Mr. Edwin Montagu), has endeavoured to make the best of a bad job; "No formal Contract for the purchase of silver was entered into with Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company. Letters of instruction were sent on each occasion, and, with the hon. member's permission I will circulate copies of them with the Votes, together with a specimen of the Contract notes that were furnished in respect of the several purchases." Mr. Rupert Gwynne then put the following supplementary question: "May I ask if he will give the complete correspondence and not merely extracts from certain letters, as he

has done previously?" To which, on November 19, 1912, the official reply was: "No, I think it was complete."

On November 22, after looking through the correspondence, Mr. Gwynne asked for "the complete correspondence which has taken place this year between the India Office and Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company in regard to the purchase of silver, instead of extracts from certain letters, as already furnished." Mr. Baker (Financial Secretary to the War Office) replied: "The correspondence circulated in accordance with the hon. member's previous question consisted of the full text of the letters instructing Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company to purchase, and of such letters from the firm as were mentioned therein. In no case was an extract given. I am now circulating with the Votes copies of such other letters as were received relating to the various orders and to the terms." On reading through those letters Mr. Gwynne found "that reference was made to other correspondence which did not appear." Consequently on November 27 he asked the Under-Secretary of State for India (absent in India) "if he will give copies of the replies of Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company to the letters written to them by the India Office on September 3 and September 11 of this year, which have been omitted from the correspondence asked for on November 22?" The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Harold Baker) replied: "I am circulating with the Votes a copy of the firm's reply to the letter of September 11, which was *omitted by an oversight* [our italics] from the correspondence previously circulated." We may say in passing that the India Office has no monopoly of this omission by oversight. On receiving this information, Mr. Rupert Gwynne discovered "that there was other information which had been kept back, and I asked for the White Paper containing the full and complete correspondence, and on December 17 a White Paper was issued, from which there was omitted the beginnings and endings of all letters, which may not be very material in ordinary cases, but in this particular case it is important because it is necessary to see who had written and who had signed these various papers." As the speaker pointed out, "the important thing is that when eventually we did get this White Paper, after four different efforts

Dentistry

to get the complete correspondence, and when it became patent what I wanted to get at, *we found that the letter of January 8, 1912, had been deliberately kept back right through the whole time* [our italics]. This letter was a most remarkable production, and it is so fantastic that I will ask the House to read it:

January 8, 1912.

* To Sir Felix Schuster, dated *January* 8, 1912.

We venture to make a suggestion to you with regard to silver purchases for the Indian Government which you may consider as of value. From our careful study of the statistical position of the Indian Treasury reserves, it appears to us that the time is not far distant when it will be considered prudent for them to strengthen themselves by coining rupees. You will not fail to have remarked, if you have read our circular, that "the net is being spread in the sight of the bird" (*sic*). If therefore you postpone your purchases until you are absolutely pressed for currency, the chances are that you will have no other supply available beyond that that is being nursed for you by Indian speculators, the inevitable result being that you will have to pay more or less whatever you are asked by them. Our proposal is this: We receive consignments from special clients of our own, of silver peculiarly adapted to coinage purposes, averaging about £50,000 per week, which we have to sell at the market prices. We suggest that we put this silver down to your account at the market prices ruling on the days we make the sale, and deposit it in the Bank of England for your account. We should not in the least disturb the market because we should make no purchases for the Council "at fixing," and what is most important no one would have the remotest idea that you were buying, and prices would not, as has been the invariable case in the past, be run up against you, as the amount of silver passing through our hands is, as you can well imagine, vastly more than £50,000 per week. Putting silver into the Bank of England is such an everyday occurrence just now, that our doing so would create no comment.

Conversion of India Office

Then follow the two paragraphs which possibly account for Mr. Gwynne's difficulty in extracting this interesting letter from the India Office. Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company say: "We particularly do not care about approaching Edwin Montagu † on this matter for reasons that must be obvious to you. We do not see, however, that our close relationship to this gentleman should militate against the Indian Council's doing business with us if they conscientiously think that it is to their advantage to do so." This was followed the next day by what Mr. Rupert Gwynne described as "this short but rather significant letter:

* Chairman of the Finance Committee of the India Office and of Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company's bank.

† The Under-Secretary of State for India.

"'DEAR SIR FELIX SCHUSTER,

"'Of course there would be no need for the Bank of England to be made acquainted with your purchases. They need only be told that they are to receive the silver against loans. This method would, I think, close every possibility of a leakage.

"'Yours very truly,

"'E. L. FRANKLIN.'" *

Up till then it had not occurred to the India Office, so far as could be ascertained, "that there was any reason for them to alter the ordinary process by which they had in the past been in the habit of making their purchases of silver. They had had no reason to complain of the way in which the Bank of England had carried through their business in the past. It had been the custom of the India Office when silver was required to instruct the Bank of England who, in their turn, instructed one of the bullion brokers to make the purchases." Indeed, so far from being dissatisfied with the Bank of England, the India Office had in 1906 entered into an agreement with the Bank of England to carry out the purchases for seven years on specially reduced terms. We believe that we express the opinion of 99 Englishmen out of 100, if not of the entire 100, that we would far sooner that the India Office bought its silver through the Bank of England even if they had to pay slightly more for it than that they should transfer the transaction to Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company, or to any other firm closely united by family ties with the Government. If people can't understand that these things should not be done we are sorry for them, though we cannot argue with them. It is a question of feeling and propriety. As Mr. Rupert Gwynne reminded the House of Commons, "Yet, after the receipt of this letter from Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company, it seems to have suddenly occurred to Sir Felix Schuster that something must be wrong with the way in which the work had been carried out through the Bank of England. This heaven-born inspiration which seized Mr. Franklin of Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company, or Sir Felix Schuster, or all of them at the same time, seems to have had great authority with the Financial Committee of the India Office."

* A prominent member of the firm of Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company, and, according to Mr. Gwynne, a brother-in-law of the Under-Secretary for India as also of the Postmaster-General.

Mr. Rupert Gwynne subjected the letter of Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company to a searching and acute analysis which we have no space to reproduce, and in reference to the sentence, "We particularly do not care about approaching Edwin Montagu on this matter for reasons that must be obvious to you," he quoted Lord Crewe's nonsense in the House of Lords on November 14: "It must be remembered [said Lord Crewe] that as a matter of fact Mr. Montagu has no more to do with the finance of India at the India Office than he has to do with the finance of the Panama Canal, and he has no more connection with the firm of Samuel Montagu and Company than with the firm of Marshall and Snelgrove." That is on the face of it a complete vindication of the position of Mr. Montagu, the Under-Secretary for India, who obviously has no connection whatsoever with the Panama Canal or with Messrs. Marshall and Snelgrove, but we cannot resist asking Lord Crewe one very simple question, namely, if Mr. Edwin Montagu has so little connection with Indian Finance and is unknown to the firm of Samuel Montagu and Company, why should that firm write thus, "We particularly do not care about approaching Edwin Montagu on this matter for reasons that must be obvious to you." Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company thereby show that they are more squeamish, as perhaps Lord Crewe might say, or more delicate, as we should prefer to suggest, than the Secretary of State for India. Mr. Rupert Gwynne disclaimed all idea of suggesting that this Contract was obtained by Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company, "either by the influence of or at the wish of the Under-Secretary of State. I admit at once without reservation that I do not believe that at the time this letter was written, or when it was received, the Under-Secretary of State knew anything about it at all." Indeed, he was inclined to say on behalf of the Under-Secretary of State, not "spare me from my friends," but "save me from my relations." Mr. Edwin Montagu had been placed "in a most unfortunate position, and my only regret is that he is not here himself to-day in order that I may make these statements in his presence. Let me say at once it is not my fault. We have not proceeded with this discussion until there has been ample time for the Under-Secretary to come back from India three or four times." [An hon. member: "Why

Lord Crewe's Contribution

should he come?"] Because it is most desirable that when a question of this sort is being raised there should be an official representative of the India Office in this House."

Mr. Rupert Gwynne refused to be browbeaten by the Prime Minister, who enquired, "What is the charge against the Under-Secretary?" To which the speaker retorted,

An Absentee Under-Secretary

I have said distinctly I make no charge against the Under-Secretary. This charge is against the Government for having permitted contracts to be given to the family of the Under-Secretary, and, quite apart from the fact that the Under-Secretary is connected with the firm of Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company, when there was a question of an investigation or allegation of any kind against the India Office, I think it would have been much better if he came back so as to be in his place, quite apart from personal consideration, because we have had to get the information from some one who obviously was not in the same position to give it as the Under-Secretary would himself have been.

Mr. Rupert Gwynne made the crushing rejoinder to Lord Crewe's silly suggestion as to the Under-Secretary's having no more to do with Indian Finance than with the Finance of the Panama Canal, "that the Under-Secretary, whatever his position or whatever part he takes in the discussions of the Finance Committee, is, so far as this House is concerned, the sole representative of the India Office, and it is his duty often to explain the financial policy of the India Office, and therefore it was his duty to know what was going on in the Finance Committee so that he could keep the House informed, and, if they wished it, to inform them of the transactions and the work of that Department." As regards Lord Crewe's other equally silly observations, Mr. Rupert Gwynne pointed out that the personnel of the firm of Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company consisted of Lord Swaythling and Mr. Gerald Montagu, both brothers of the Under-Secretary, while Sir Stuart Samuel was brother of the Postmaster-General and cousin of the Under-Secretary. Then there was Mr. Franklin, so prominent in the negotiations, who was a double brother-in-law, *i.e.* of the Postmaster-General and the Under-Secretary. The firm was closely connected with the Radical Party. Lord Swaythling supported Lord Crewe in the one House, while Sir Stuart Samuel upheld the Government in the other. Moreover, there was a further connecting link in the shape of Sir Felix Schuster, who was Chairman of the Finance Committee of the

India Office and Banker to Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company. "Any one of these connections might not be very strong, but putting them altogether it does make a case, at any rate strong enough." We should say that all our quotations are taken from the Official Report.

Ministerial Surrender

THE exigencies of space compel us to pass rapidly to the *dénouement*, but the rest of Mr. Gwynne's speech is as interesting as the passages we have referred to, particularly his references to the treatment of the Bank of England, which it would probably be not uncharitable to attribute to political malice, the secretiveness of the Government and the sacrifice of Indian interests to interests bound up with the London money market. Mr. Harold Baker, upon whose shoulders has fallen the invidious task in the prolonged absence of Mr. Edwin Montagu in India—where he is certainly not wanted, as the Indian Government is perfectly capable of governing that country without the assistance of a minor mandarin from the India Office—contented himself with the usual official explanation with which it is sought to smooth over every awkward incident and which leaves things essentially as they were. All was for the best in the best of all possible Departments. The single object of the India Office had been to meet prompt questions by equally prompt information. Only a monomaniac could harbour any suspicions either concerning these silver transactions with Messrs. Samuel Montagu and Company or the general silver policy of an all-wise Office. Our readers are only too familiar with the kind of thing. It is kept permanently on tap on the Treasury Bench whatever Party is in power. Such speeches court and usually meet with humiliation, but as they are the stock-in-trade of Jacks in office they will presumably continue until the end of the chapter. After an excellent speech from Mr. Bonar Law—with the tone and temper of which even Mr. Asquith could not quarrel—who declared that "the very last thing you ought to do is to give Government business which might be of special value to a firm which is specially connected with the Government," a doctrine with which the Prime Minister agreed, though he argued that such a principle did not apply when there was a public advantage to be served as in the present case. Of

course we dispute this, as the moral loss in this case has been infinitely greater than any possible material gain. That Ministers themselves recognise that our Indian Silver policy requires overhauling is proved by Mr. Asquith's concluding declaration in favour of a Royal Commission on India Office Finance. The Infallibles have taken another tumble, upon which Mr. Rupert Gwynne, Mr. Touche, and other members who have tackled a most difficult question are to be heartily congratulated. We should very much like to know how much has been made by lucky speculators in the Silver market during the past year, as also the names of the fortunate ones " in the know."

Arson as Argument

Now that one of Mr. Lloyd George's country-houses has been blown up by lunatics at large who openly glory in their crime, perhaps the Law Officers of the Crown may be moved to ascertain whether the present law is powerless to cope with female maniacs and whether it is beyond the wit of man to devise suitable methods of meeting the situation. How many more outrages must the Stage Army perpetrate before Ministers screw themselves up to serious action? We are fully conscious of the difficulty of coping with demented women however unsexed, but surely now that we have reached the dynamite stage, and there may be grave loss of life at any moment, Ministers can no longer shirk responsibility, for if they do, in sheer self-defence people will be obliged to take the law into their own hands and the Lord Chief Justice Lynch who pervades many parts of the United States will be installed here. Experience shows that imprisonment or fining is perfectly useless under present conditions, as hunger-strikes are allowed to defeat the one and money will not be lacking for the other, while default would only mean imprisonment. So we move in a vicious circle. The authorities must therefore either make up their mind to let hunger-strikers commit suicide (though probably if some milk were left in their cells they could not long resist the temptation of drinking enough to keep body and soul together), or they must meet an exceptional situation with exceptional measures and introduce a Bill to enable these hysterical hooligans to be deported to one of the many vacant islands in some distant Dominion of the King. They could be provided with plenty of food, clothing, and shelter, and they would have each other's company to beguile

the time. We cannot help feeling that the creation of a suffragette colony would succeed where other measures have failed, but in any event things cannot go on as at present.

"A Pleasure-House"

We should not have deemed the present moment peculiarly opportune to emphasise the interesting discovery of the existence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's second country-house, but we are challenged to do so by a Radical paper. We say "second" because we have seen photographs of No. 1—an attractive seat dominating the landscape near Criccieth, in North Wales, and built within the last few years. Even the *Daily Chronicle* would scarcely attempt to deny its existence, and we should have been quite content for the moment to leave the new abode at Walton Heath with an expression of regret at this latest Suffragette outrage. But the *Daily Chronicle* will not have it so, and gratuitously challenges us on an issue we have no temptation to shirk. Radicals are becoming wonderfully sensitive about Mr. Lloyd George's possessions, which is scarcely surprising considering that he and they live by attacking the possessions of other people. They would range the "have-nots" against the "haves," conveniently forgetting that many of them are among the most substantial "haves" in the country. In a paragraph entitled "Week-end Cottage" the *Daily Chronicle* (February 20) declares that "many exaggerations have appeared in the Press with regard to this house which Mr. Lloyd George was about to occupy. The *National Review* described it as a 'pleasure-house' and, with its characteristic disregard for facts, stated that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was building it." Unless we are much mistaken it was the *Times* which first announced in its personal column the interesting intelligence that Mr. Lloyd George was "building" a house at Walton Heath, of which we had never heard until we saw the statement in the *Times*. If we have described it as a "pleasure-house" that would be exactly in accordance with the facts as set forth in the Radical Press, including the *Daily Chronicle*, which, however, for the benefit of its unsophisticated readers insists that "it is quite an ordinary week-end cottage, providing the usual comforts of a suburban home." Now surely a week-end cottage does not pretend to be anything but a "pleasure-house," and, as we learn from our contemporary, "the house [*sic*],

which was almost ready for occupation, stands on an estate which is the property of Sir George Riddell, who has done much for the development of Walton Heath district."

"A Week-end Cottage"

ACCORDING to the *Daily Chronicle* "Walton Heath is one of the healthiest outposts of London. It stands from 600 ft. to 700 ft. above sea-level. It is a plateau with a vast expanse of heath, in the centre of which is the famous golf course where the five-times World Champion, Mr. James Braid, is the professional." This is all most delightful, also that "Walton Heath is within an hour's motor run from Charing Cross. Already a number of houses have been erected on Sir George Riddell's estate, and they are remarkable for the good taste shown in the designs, and for the comfort of the internal arrangements." We never doubted it for a moment. The *Daily Chronicle,* which takes this "week-end cottage" or "pleasure-house" very seriously, has succeeded, thanks to the courtesy of Sir George Riddell's architect, Mr. Morley Horder (who we trust will not be offended if we venture to congratulate him on having built a delightful "pleasure-house" for the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if we may judge by the photograph in the *Daily Chronicle*), in obtaining "a drawing and a description of the house of which Mr. Lloyd George is taking the lease," from which we learn that this interesting abode consists of "one reception-room or hall under Mr. Lloyd George's library and the dining-room. There are four bedrooms and one servants' bedroom. The house stands in about a third of an acre of land." From this we may infer two things: in the first place, that Mr. Lloyd George does not regard land as a particularly profitable investment at the present moment, and, in the second place, for a house of this size and social capacities the servants' quarters strike an impartial onlooker as somewhat inadequate. However, the *Daily Chronicle* is satisfied, which is the main thing. "There are no indications of the alleged extravagant luxury in this house, unless an exception is made in the case of the two baths which it contains. It is also interesting to note from the plan that the kitchen range has been placed in the scullery so that the kitchen itself may thereby be made a more comfortable room for the accommodation of *servants.*" But then we have been told there is only one servant's bedroom. Surely one servant one room

is good sound democratic doctrine? We are relying on the *Daily Chronicle* for the facts which is perhaps rather foolish. According to our contemporary. "The total cost of the building has been £2000." There are also very attractive photographs of this "week-end cottage" or "pleasure-house," whichever it may be, both in the *Manchester Guardian* and in the *Daily News*, and while reiterating our sincere regret that any disaster should have befallen such a cheap though charming residence, on the acquisition of which, whether by lease or otherwise, the Chancellor of the Exchequer must be heartily congratulated, we remain at a loss to understand why the *Daily Chronicle* should be enraged by our describing a golfing lodge as a "pleasure-house."

One Man One House

THE public will be glad to learn, as indicating the happy intimacy between colleagues, that, according to the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Westminster Gazette*, Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Masterman are also to have "pleasure-houses" on this very delectable spot, where doubtless they will be able to concert great constructive policies for the advancement and glory of the British Empire and the prosperity of the English people. We must, however, say, *pace* the *Daily Chronicle* or any other outraged organs of the Coalition, that whether the description of the *Daily Chronicle* is more accurate than that of the *National Review*, or *vice versa*, whether we are dealing with "a week-end cottage" or "a pleasure-house," it should not be possible in a community calling itself intelligent that a man of Mr. Lloyd George's means should devote his talents to perambulating the country, fomenting class hatreds and setting the poor against the class to which he belongs on the pretext that he is a man of the people. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is entitled to buy, build, or hire as many houses as he pleases—shooting lodges or golfing lodges—as also to tour abroad in the magnificent motors of his millionaire friends and to luxuriate at palatial hotels; but he is not entitled to hold up to execration other people who lead infinitely more laborious and less luxurious lives, who have the misfortune to own land instead of "pleasure-houses," merely because they are of different politics, nor is he entitled to pose as a poor man. Limehouse speeches are not compatible with lordly pleasure-houses. The democratic doctrine of "one man one house" has gone by the board. Since the above was

written we have had the inestimable advantage of consulting no less an authority than the *News of the World* (of which it is understood Sir George Riddell is the principal proprietor), and we learn from this unimpeachable authority (February 23) that though "The house [*sic*] is what is technically described as a week-end golf cottage, it is built on the modern villa line and is constructed in red brick with a red tiled roof. It contains fourteen rooms—six of them bedrooms—and stands in the centre of a considerable plot of land." We invite the *Daily Chronicle* to put this in its pipe and smoke it.

Near Eastern War

WHEN we last went to press the peace negotiations were collapsing and it appeared to be only a question of hours as to when hostilities would be resumed between Turkey and the Balkan allies, though the usual optimist was forthcoming predicting some unforeseen Providential interposition which, needless to say, did not occur. War was renewed on February 3, and the public expected to hear forthwith of sanguinary encounters such as the mythical battle of Kirk Kilisse—which, according to a well-informed *Times* military correspondent who visited the theatre of war during the armistice, was a very tame affair—but from that day to this, about three weeks, there have been little more than "rumours," and so far as the outside world is concerned there might have been no war at all. The *Times* correspondent in question brings out clearly how great a part secrecy played in the former remarkable Bulgarian campaign, and the same wise reserve has been rigorously practised in the second stage. Doubtless, we shall know nothing until something decisive has happened, which can hardly be very remote. That the resources of civilisation in the shape of news-gathering, which is one of the most highly developed of modern arts, should have been completely outwitted by one small peasant State at no great distance from such a town as Vienna is not the least of its many striking achievements. The Press has accepted the situation philosophically, as every one can appreciate the exigencies of a tiny community which, after making heroic efforts and sustaining tremendous losses, still finds herself confronting the might of Turkey with the watchful, suspicious and hostile Rumania's intact army of about 300,000 men in her rear. The best

news of the month is that in spite of the excitement stoked up in Austria against Russia by the German Press there appears to have been a decided *détente* in the relations between the Governments of Vienna and St. Petersburg—where public feeling has also been strongly roused—as may be gathered from Mr. Victor Marsden's interesting article. Strong and successful pressure has been brought to bear by friendly outsiders both upon Rumania and Bulgaria to submit their differences to European mediation, and it seems probable that this solution will be adopted. On the whole there is some ground for hope that the conflict may be neither extended nor prolonged, though it would require an inspired idiot to prophesy, and in any event it will leave a legacy of difficulties in the Near East and of tension among the Great Powers. This makes such a declaration as that of President Poincaré timely and statesmanlike, using this much abused word in its proper though obsolete sense. Statesmanship does not, as parliamentarians imagine, consist in making speeches, but in the wise administration of the affairs of a State, above all in ensuring its safety against the aggressive action of ambitious neighbours.

The Rumanian Claim

WHILE there is a widespread feeling that Bulgaria is being blackmailed by an unfriendly neighbour under powerful protection, who has taken advantage of a war in which she has remained a spectator to advance extravagant claims, it should be remembered in justice to Rumania that she has a legitimate grievance originating with the Berlin Conference of 1878. The story is clearly told by the well-informed special correspondent of the *Times* at Bukarest (*see Times*, February 22). After announcing that from deference to the Powers Rumania will accept Sir Edward Grey's proposal of mediation, a decision which "may be regarded as another triumph for Sir Edward Grey and the cause of peace," the correspondent reminds us that this action reflects "some credit on the Rumanian Government which will undoubtedly have to bear a great deal of criticism at home for subordinating national interests to the goodwill of Europe." The Rumanian case in the present dispute is briefly as follows: In 1903, at a time when the condition of European Turkey was acute, Rumania sent a

Circular to the Powers, pointing out that she would do nothing to disturb the peace, but could not remain indifferent to any change in the *status quo* established by the Treaty of Berlin to which the Rumanian kingdom owes its creation. On the outbreak of the present war the Powers stated that no change in the *status quo* would be permitted, and Rumania received explicit assurances from Bulgaria that no such change was contemplated, it being fully understood in Sofia that if this condition were departed from Rumania would formulate her claims. Directly the development of the war made it obvious that the *status quo* had been abandoned, Rumania was anxious to begin negotiations with Bulgaria, who showed a desire to postpone negotiation until peace had been concluded with Turkey, an attitude which, according to the correspondent we have quoted, "Rumania distrusted." Throughout the war Rumania has abstained from fighting for her interests, for which she was fully prepared, partly from motives of expediency, but also because both Austria-Hungary and Russia assured Rumania that her claims would be supported, and on the strength of such assurances "the Government held out hopes to the country which it is now attempting to justify." The rectification of the Dobrudja frontier is not a mere abstract question of right and wrong, but solely of national interests and therefore unsuitable for arbitration. The Dobrudja was given to Rumania under the Treaty of Berlin, with an absolutely defenceless frontier that necessitated the expenditure of enormous sums on the construction of the Port of Constantza, and, suspecting Bulgaria of seeking to recover "what before 1878 was Bulgarian territory under Turkish rule, Rumania now wishes, in the general supersession of the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin, to remove her grievance of being given an unnatural and defenceless frontier to a territory which she did not desire when she received it, but which she has since made valuable." All fair-minded Russians recognise that Rumania was hardly dealt with considering the services she rendered that Power in the crisis of her struggle with Turkey. According to the Bukarest correspondent of the *Times*, "just as the present difficulty between Austria-Hungary and Russia was bequeathed by Count Aehrenthal's policy in 1909, so the present dispute between Rumania and Bulgaria is a legacy from Russian ingratitude in 1878, when Rumania's help was

rewarded by the seizure of Bessarabia and the grant of the unwelcome substitute, the Dobrudja."

The Antarctic Catastrophe

The civilised world has been profoundly moved by the tragic disaster which has befallen Captain Scott's Antarctic Expedition, resulting in the loss of its gallant leader and four of his devoted followers constituting the Southern party. They actually reached the South Pole on January 17, 1912, only to find that Amundsen had forestalled them by a month, as his records were dated December 14, 1911. On their return journey they encountered an appalling blizzard against which they manfully but unavailingly struggled. They died at the end of March of last year when one hundred and fifty-five miles from the base and only eleven miles from the nearest depot of supplies. Captain Scott, Dr. Wilson the Surgeon, and Lieut. Bowers succumbed from exposure, while Captain Oates had voluntarily perished a fortnight before the others so as not to encumber them in his weak state of health, and Petty Officer Evans died a month earlier from concussion of the brain. The history of the closing days of this wonderful journey was found upon the bodies of the dead, which were subsequently discovered by the search party within a few miles of safety, among other documents being Captain Scott's diary written within four days of his death. After describing the earlier difficulties of the expedition throughout 1911 and the loss sustained by the death of Evans, the writer speaks of the surprising conditions on the Beardmore Glacier, where the temperature varied between a maximum of minus 20° by day to a continuous night temperature of minus 47° coupled with strong head-winds.

I do not think human beings ever came through such a month as we have come through, and we should have got through in spite of the weather but for the sickening of a second companion, Captain Oates, and the shortage of fuel in our depots . . . and, finally, but for the storm which has fallen on us within eleven miles of this depot. . . . We arrived within eleven miles of our old One Ton Camp with fuel for one hot meal and food for two days For four days we have been unable to leave the tent, a gale blowing about us. We are weak, writing is difficult; but for my own part I do not regret this journey which has shown that Englishmen can endure hardship, help one another, and meet death with as great a fortitude as ever in the past. We took risks—we knew we took them. Things have come out against us, and therefore we have no cause for complaint, but bow to the will of Providence, determined still to do our best to the last.

One sentence from this fateful message has gone straight to the heart of the nation, and from the King downwards there has been no lack of response.

> But if we have been willing to give our lives to this enterprise, which is for the honour of our country, I appeal to our countrymen to see that those who depend on us are properly cared for. Had we lived I should have had a tale to tell of the hardihood, endurance, and courage of my companions which would have stirred the heart of every Englishman. These rough notes and our dead bodies must tell the tale, but surely, surely a rich, great country like ours will see that those who are dependent upon us are properly provided for. (Signed, R. Scott, 25th of March 1912).

Although every form of honour has been paid to the memory of the dead, nothing is more moving than the record to the heroes erected on the spot where they fell by the search party of Commander Evans, R.N., commanding the British Antarctic Expedition, which reached the tent on November 10, 1912. A cross and cairn were erected over the remains of Captain R. F. Scott, C.V.O., R.N., Dr. E. A. Wilson, and Lieutenant H. R. Bowers, R.I.M. "As a slight token to perpetuate their gallant and successful attempt to reach the goal. This they did on January 17, 1912, after the Norwegians had already done so on December 14, 1911. Also to commemorate their two gallant comrades, Captain L. E. G. Oates of the Inniskillen Dragoons, who walked to his death in a blizzard willingly, about twenty miles south of this place, to try and save his comrades beset by hardship; also Petty Officer Edgar Evans, who died at the foot of the Beardmore Glacier. The Lord gave and the Lord taketh away. Blessed be the name of the Lord." A further cross and cairn were erected by the search party at about the spot where Captain Oates laid down his life, bearing this beautiful inscription: "Hereabouts died a very gallant gentleman."

• •

THE FIGHT FOR CLEAN GOVERNMENT

I

SPECIAL REPORT AND MINUTES OF EVIDENCE FROM THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON MARCONI'S WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY, LIMITED, AGREEMENT *

Ordered by The House of Commons *to be printed February 12, 1913*

Special Report. Sir Albert Spicer reported from the Select Committee on Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Company, Limited, Agreement:

That Mr. L. J. Maxse, a Witness before this Committee, had refused to give information in his possession and to produce letters asked for by the Committee, which in the opinion of the Committee should be laid before them.

He had, therefore, been instructed by the Committee to report the circumstance to the House, in order that the House may take such steps as may seem to the House proper and necessary.

Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee:

Wednesday, 12*th February*, 1913. Members Present: Mr. Amery; Mr. Booth; Lord Robert Cecil; Mr. George Faber; Mr. Falconer; Mr. Gordon Harvey; Mr. Macmaster; Mr. Mooney; Mr. James Parker; Mr. Primrose; Mr. William Redmond; Sir Albert Spicer. (Sir Albert Spicer in the Chair.)

Mr. Leopold James Maxse, Sworn; and Examined.

Chairman (to Mr. Douglas Hogg): Do you represent Mr. Maxse?

* This report is printed as published with the Parliamentary Orders of the Day. Some obvious blunders are corrected and some trifling alterations made. The questions to and answers of the witness are set out more clearly than in the original.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: Yes, I do.

Examined by *Mr. Douglas Hogg*: *Ques.* I think you are the editor and proprietor of the *National Review*? *Ans.* Yes, for nearly twenty years. This is my twentieth year of editorship and ownership.

Q. How and when was your attention first directed to the Marconi agreement? *A.* I unfortunately cannot claim to have been a pioneer in the Marconi business, as it was not until the month of July 1912 that my attention was called to the matter. There had been no discussion in the Press—at any rate in newspapers I read—though doubtless there had been much talk in the City and some questions asked in Parliament which attracted little public attention and no Press comment. In July 1912 the Marconi affair was represented to me as a subject demanding investigation, and I began making enquiries. Everything I heard went to show that there was something curious about it, and the story told week by week in the *Outlook*, beginning on July 20, by a writer of the acknowledged competence and authority of Mr. W. R. Lawson, who had never been associated with any cheap journalistic sensation, showed that the whole question ought to be thrashed out, particularly the negotiations between the Marconi Company and the Government—all the more so because at no time was any effort whatsoever made to refute the damaging statements of Mr. Lawson.

Q. What first impressed you with regard to the matter? *A.* Among the extraordinary features of the affair which impressed every one who went into it, was the amazing gamble in the shares of a company engaged in confidential negotiations with the British Government, which indicated leakage from one quarter or another. Then there was the impenetrable secrecy of Ministers and the evasive answers returned to all enquiries in the House of Commons, whether from Ministerial or Opposition Benches. No quibbling, however clever, can conceal the fact that the House of Commons was misled about a definite arrangement concluded in the beginning of March, and virtually settled some months before, which the Marconi gamblers were exploiting to the utmost. Hundreds of thousands, and, perhaps, millions of pounds changed hands, to the immense advantage of privileged persons "in the know" and their friends. Take these suggestive figures. There

was a startling rise in the price of Marconi shares in December 1911 (when negotiations with the Government were hot), from 2¼ to 3¼, and another sensational rise in the critical month of January 1912 to 4¼, when the arrangements were practically concluded, while in March again after the acceptance of the Marconi tender, about which vital information was studiously withheld from the House of Commons, the speculators were able to make another "scoop." Ultimately the shares were worked up to nearly £10 in the middle of April on the faith of a contract the existence of which continues to be denied by the Postmaster-General though not by the Attorney-General, who specifically described the March agreement as "a contract." It is noteworthy that the latest issue of the Stock Exchange Year Book agrees with the Attorney-General rather than the Postmaster-General in regarding March as the important date. Under the heading "Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Company," the following passage will be found: "In March 1912 the Company entered into an agreement with His Majesty's Postmaster-General for the construction of long-distance wireless stations, which will be required within the next few years for the Imperial wireless scheme. The stations will be operated by the Company on account of the Government for the first six months, and thereafter by the Government. Under the terms of this agreement the Company is to receive payment of £60,000 for each station, exclusive of site, foundations for machinery and buildings, and the buildings themselves, and 10 per cent. of the gross receipts of all the stations so erected for the term of the agreement, which is twenty-eight years from the date of the opening of the service of the first three stations, while the Government has power to terminate the agreement at the expiration of eighteen years, but in that event would cease to have the right to use any of the Company's patented processes or machinery."

Q. What do you say the Postmaster-General ought to have done? What is it you are complaining of? *A.* One accusation against Mr. Samuel is that he stood by and allowed a shameless gamble in the shares of a company entering into partnership with the British Government, which the Postmaster-General could have nipped in the bud from the outset had he taken the House of Commons and the public frankly into his confidence

and announced directly he realised the manner of men he was dealing with, that in any event the Marconi contract would be submitted to a strong and independent tribunal before ratification. As a matter of fact, Mr. Samuel preferred to burke all discussion, and intended to hustle the Marconi contract undiscussed through the House of Commons in the early days of August, and would have succeeded, with the machinery at the disposal of the Government, but for the action of a handful of watchful and independent Radicals backed by the Opposition, who threatened to prolong the Session unless a Select Committee were granted.

Q. Is there any other feature which impressed itself upon your mind? *A.* Another feature of this affair is the personality of the managing director of the Marconi Company—namely Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, who appears to have dealt with the British Government as though he were one of the Great Powers. Who is this Mr. Godfrey Isaacs? Why is he managing director of the Marconi Company? There is nothing in his somewhat chequered career to suggest his suitability for such a high and responsible position; it is not easy to discover successful concerns with which he had been previously associated, and there is nothing to explain the action of the Post Office and the Government in knuckling down, as they have done, to Mr. Godfrey Isaacs. Had Mr. Godfrey Isaacs any standing as a man of affairs, less attention would have been concentrated on the fact that he happens to be a brother of a very distinguished and highly respected member of the Radical Party, Sir Rufus Isaacs, who became Solicitor-General in March 1910—only two months after Mr. Godfrey Isaacs became managing director of the Marconi Company, and the very month he tried to open negotiations with the British Government. These different appointments were interesting. No one imagines that Sir Rufus Isaacs was made Solicitor-General (for which he was clearly marked out by conspicuous talent) because his brother was managing director of the Marconi Company, but that Mr. Godfrey Isaacs may have been appointed managing director of the Marconi Company, for which he was not clearly marked out, because he was thought likely to have a "pull" on the Government. Sir Rufus Isaacs had been a shareholder in some of his brother's unfortunate concerns, and what more natural in the eyes of the public than that he should take a fraternal interest

in the Marconi Company? As we learnt, from a recent statement in the House of Commons (October 11), Sir Rufus Isaacs had no interest whatsoever in the Marconi Company; he never discussed its affairs with his brother; and he was not even aware that any negotiations were afoot between the Company and the Government until the eve of their conclusion in March—a statement which may be satisfactory to him as a man of honour, but is not altogether satisfactory to the public, as it indicated that our conspicuously helpless Post Office was destitute of the expert assistance of the Attorney-General in their dealings with his exceedingly astute brother, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, on matters involving difficult legal questions. Unwittingly, also, Sir Rufus Isaacs promoted the Marconi boom by sending the following telegram to a Marconi banquet held in New York, March 16, 1912. The telegram is dated March 17: "Please congratulate Marconi and my brother on the successful development of a marvellous enterprise. I wish them all success in New York. I hope when you come back the coal strike will be finished—Rufus Isaacs." Sir Rufus Isaacs has dismissed this telegram as "a very trumpery affair." But it was not trumpery to its recipients, as it emphasised afresh the connection between the Company and the Government, with obvious consequences. Sir Rufus Isaacs' memory was at fault in suggesting in the House of Commons that the boom in Marconi shares was over when he sent this telegram, for, as we have seen, these lively securities subsequently soared to over £9 in the middle of April. Most people will be disposed to agree with the observation of the Parliamentary Correspondent of the *Daily News and Leader*, a thick-and-thin supporter of the Ministry: "We agree that it would have been better if the managing director of the company with which the Postmaster-General had to do business had been some one else than the Attorney-General's brother, though it is fair to remember that he occupied the position before Sir Rufus Isaacs held office. The association entitled critics on all sides to watch the negotiations with the very closest scrutiny. It did not entitle them to poison the air."

Q. What did poison the air in your view? *A.* The air has been poisoned, not by criticism, which would have been futile without something to feed on, but by the unfortunate circum-

stances enveloping this affair, and Ministers are primarily responsible for any suspicions which may be rife. When they should have been peculiarly careful they were particularly careless; and as large fortunes have been made under strange names across the water, and every conceivable artifice has been resorted to in order to conceal the identity of speculators evidently in touch with each successive phase of confidential negotiations, Ministers have no one but themselves to thank—especially the childish secretiveness of the Postmaster-General—if their reputations stand to-day somewhat lower than that of Cæsar's wife.

Q. Are you suggesting that Sir Rufus Isaacs ought not to have accepted office? *A*. If I am asked whether Sir Rufus Isaacs should have declined office or left office, because his brother was managing director of the Marconi Company, I should say, no; but no one has yet attempted to offer any satisfactory explanation of the appointment of Mr. Godfrey Isaacs; and in any event, the Attorney-General ought to have appreciated the false position in which he, as the principal Law Officer of the Crown, would be placed if his brother conducted the negotiations for the Wireless Telegraphy contract between the Company and the Government.

Mr. Mooney: *Q*. You leave out the words, "and a Cabinet Minister"?* *A*. Yes, I leave out those words. There can be no two opinions on this point. Mr. Godfrey Isaacs should have been content to remain in the background and allow some other member of the numerous Marconi Board to negotiate. I am sure that every civil servant would regard this as a reasonable doctrine. Unfortunately, it was Mr. Godfrey Isaacs' *surname* that was so valuable to the Company, and the speculators operating under the great name of Marconi, though the Marconi interest in the Marconi Company appears to have been substantially reduced, and to their credit be it said there was no mystery about the disposal of shares belonging to the Marconi family, who sold openly, under their own name, without seeking any disguises.

* In my précis of evidence which was delivered to the Select Committee on or about January 1, 1913, *i.e.* six weeks before I gave evidence, the Attorney-General was erroneously described as a "Cabinet Minister" in March 1912 three months before he attained that exceptional honour.

Mr. Doug[illegible] Q. [illegible] immediately notic[illegible] before you published your first a[illegible] A. The *National Review* published nothing upon the Marconi question until the month of September, and it would only weary the Committee to recapitulate the many curious things that had then happened. Not the least curious was the prolonged, unbroken silence of the Ministerial Press, which had not a word to say when ultimately, after being in labour, the Post Office triumphantly produced the Marconi contract of July 19—two months after the boom, and, as is notorious, so little enthusiasm did this performance inspire that the Prime Minister found himself constrained to promise to refer the matter to a Select Committee before the House of Commons was asked to ratify the contract. One thing that encouraged me to take the matter up was that among its active opponents were ardent Radicals, so one could not be fairly accused of being actuated by party malice, however little one might love the present Government. I feared that on the reopening of Parliament in October, in view of the congested condition of business, the promised Select Committee might be forgotten, and it was necessary to get up steam in order to ensure its effective appointment. The September number of the *National Review* called attention to the *Outlook* campaign, and referred to the unpleasant rumours in the City concerning some of his Majesty's Ministers. It also contained a short temperate impersonal article by Major Archer-Shee, which opened the eyes of influential journals to the importance of the much neglected Marconi question. The silence of the Ministerial Press continued. I do not remember reading any article defending or explaining the action of the Post Office. This seemed ominous, and I remained afraid lest the policy of shirking and burking discussion might triumph in the autumn, so I asked Mr. Lawson to recapitulate the case as set forth in his *Outlook* articles for the October number of the *National Review*, which he did in so admirable and convincing a manner that at last the general boycott broke down, and even Radical papers plucked up courage to criticise and condemn an agreement which, so far as I know, is condemned by every one with a soul to call his own.

Q. What happened after the publication of the October article? *A.* The Committee was appointed after a heated debate

in the House of Commons, during which the Postmaster-General and the Attorney-General made the speeches you all know containing indignant repudiations of rumours concerning suggested Ministerial dealings in shares. But, in one case, the repudiation was too comprehensive, as it embraced the entire Cabinet, with whose private affairs it is impossible for the Postmaster-General to be intimately acquainted, while in the other case it was too narrow, as it did not cover indirect dealings such as that already brought before the Committee—*e.g.* the use of Mr. Montagu's name. In passing I would observe that Sir Rufus Isaacs had no right to resent any suggestion that he might have speculated in Marconi shares, for the simple reason that he informed the House that he never even knew the Marconi Company was dealing with the Government until the eve of the acceptance of the tender in the beginning of March of last year, which he only learnt from his brother at some social function. To make things worse, the Chancellor of the Exchequer got up a perfectly gratuitous row with an old friend, Mr. George Lansbury, and in his excitement Mr. Lloyd George unfortunately omitted to deny that he had had any dealings in Marconi shares. If significance be attached to the denials of other Ministers, which we are invited to regard as final, some significance must surely be attached to Mr. Lloyd George's omission, which may have been an oversight. The public are undoubtedly uneasy about this business, because the rumours about particular Ministers—not the Postmaster-General—are circumstantial and persistent, and it may be hoped that whatever else it may do the present Committee may be able to vindicate the fame of one and all of his Majesty's Ministers. I confess to sharing the general uneasiness as matters stand at present. Over four months have elapsed since the discussion in the House of Commons, but Ministers have done nothing whatsoever to dispel the mist of suspicion overhanging the affair. Mr. Samuel stated that Ministers "will be most ready to appear before"—I am quoting him—the Committee. One might have conceived that they would have appeared at its first sitting clamouring to state in the most categorical and emphatic manner that neither directly nor indirectly, in their own names or in other people's names, have they had any transactions whatsoever, either in London, Dublin, New York, Brussels, Amsterdam, Paris,

or any other financial centre, in any shares in any Marconi Company throughout the negotiations with the Government, and that neither they nor any of their belongings have participated in the profitable rings, pools, and syndicates for dealing in options of which there are believed to have been an unusual number in this business. Doubtless they will be willing to produce the pass-books of all their accounts at every bank at which they bank, fortified by the evidence of the bank managers, in order to clear the matter up so far as such evidence is conclusive. The public is equally entitled to know that Ministers, privy to the negotiations, did not take advantage of such knowledge to put their friends on to "a good thing" at the expense of less privileged individuals, as this would have been a decidedly undemocratic proceeding. In conclusion, I beg to say that I have never had any interest of any sort or kind in any company concerned with wireless telegraphy, and I have never participated in any gamble whatsoever in any shares of such companies, either here or elsewhere, nor, so far as I know, have any of my belongings. I should have been fully entitled to speculate in Marconi shares as an outsider without any fiduciary position, but as a matter of fact I did not.

Mr. James Parker: *Q.* I would like to begin my short examination by asking you one or two personal questions. I see at the head of your précis you say that you are the editor and proprietor of the *National Review*? *A.* Yes.

Q. Are you the sole proprietor? *A.* The sole proprietor.

Q. And you have been so from the commencement? *A.* Since August 1893.

Q. You will no doubt be a member of the Institute of Journalists? *A.* I think I am a nominal member. I have never attended any of its proceedings.

Q. Journalism is your particular profession? *A.* Certainly.

Q. You are not a lawyer, nor have studied law? *A.* No, I have studied law, but I was not called.

Q. You state at the commencement of the précis of your evidence that your attention was first called to this matter in July 1912. Would you mind telling the Committee who it was drew your attention to it particularly? *A.* Several people drew my attention to it—Members of Parliament and others,

I cannot remember who the first person was, and I may as well say—as it may save a great deal of trouble—that, of course, an editor depends entirely for his efficiency as an editor on the confidence that he inspires in other people, and he cannot give away confidential communications under any circumstances. I have taken a great deal of trouble to collect what evidence or information I could on this question. I have received a good deal of evidence confidentially, and I have to exercise my judgment upon it, and I am not able to give the names of people.

Mr. William Redmond: *Q*. No names at all? *A*. No.

Mr. James Parker: *Q*. You simply in a general way confine yourself to what you say in your précis—that your attention was called to it, but you do not feel called upon to give the names of the persons who called it? *A*. No, as a matter of public interest public men called my attention to it.

Q. Was it public interest or political party interest on the part of the persons who called your attention to it? *A*. I think it was public interest.

Q. None of those Members of Parliament had any political ends to serve? *A*. I had no intercourse with them; I did not correspond with Sir Henry Norman, or with Sir George Croydon Marks. I have regarded this as a non-party affair, because many who took the lead in criticising the agreement were Radicals. I was impressed by the fact that Sir Henry Norman was enquiring about it.

Q. You can mention the names of the Radical Members of Parliament with impunity? *A*. Because they came forward.

Q. But you cannot mention the names of the Members of Parliament who might have consulted you for political party purposes? *A*. No, I do not think anybody suggested that for political party purposes I should take it up. I am not accustomed to take my orders from anybody.

Q. I only wanted to get the names, if possible? *A*. I have not done it as a purely party business. If the Unionist Government had been in power I should have done exactly the same.

Q. I am very glad to hear you are so independent? *A*. I am.

Q. It is a treat to find out that there are journalists of that kind in these days? *A*. If the *Review* has any merit, it is independence.

Q. You say it was mentioned to you as a subject demanding attention, and you began making enquiries. How did you proceed with these enquiries? To whom did you go, for instance, in the beginning to find out about this agreement and the whole thing relating to it? *A*. The first things I heard about it were the rumours concerning politicians supposed to have an axe to grind. I wrote letters to different people who I thought might be able to help me in the matter, to ask them if they had heard anything about these rumours, and I also saw a considerable number of people about it, and have continued doing so from that day to this, and the answers I got were almost invariably the same, namely that owing to the unfortunate circumstances of the case Ministers' names had been dragged in, and there was a general belief in the City, which I have heard of from brokers, bankers, and men of business of all kinds, that there had been gambling in the Marconi shares.

Q. All the world knows that there is always gambling on the Stock Exchange? *A*. Quite so; but in this particular case Ministers were believed by a very large number of people—you must have heard about it at the time yourself—to have gambled in the Marconi shares.

Q. You heard these rumours yourself from persons when you made enquiries? *A*. Certain persons in whom I believed—yes.

Q. Did you make enquiry by letter at all? *A*. I made some enquiry by letters.

Q. Could you produce the letters to this Committee. Let me put it in this way: In one part of your article you refer to this Committee being reluctant to bring out the facts. Those are not the exact words, but the word "reluctant" is used. I want to convince you, if I can, that as far as I am concerned, and I believe all the members of the Committee, but speaking for myself at the moment, I am not reluctant to bring out any facts that you have got. The Committee are anxious, and have shown their anxiety to bring out facts. The Committee are seeking the source of these statements and rumours. What facts did you obtain from these people? Can you produce the letters of the persons to whom you wrote and the replies by letter, if there were such, that they sent to you? *A*. No, and if I were able to produce them I should not be able to produce confidential

enquiries which I made, because of course it would destroy my usefulness in the future. If people to whom I wrote confidential letters asking for information, or for verification of information, believed that I was a person who was capable of giving away their names in public, naturally in the future I could not expect to have such information sent to me. An editor is the recipient of a great deal of information and has to exercise his discretion with regard to it.

Q. Do you suggest to the Committee that these people, who supplied you with this confidential information, have actually given you the names of persons whose names would be useful to this Committee, and which you decline to supply to us because of some confidence that you feel yourself subject to? *A.* That is rather a long question.

Q. I will try and put the question in a plain matter-of-fact way. Do you suggest to the Committee that the information that you have obtained by letter from these persons does contain names that would be useful to this Committee in coming to conclusions, but that you decline to disclose them because you feel that the letters were sent to you privately in confidence? *A.* I should not be able to disclose to any Committee letters which were written to me confidentially, just as other people to whom I wrote confidential letters would not be able to disclose them.

Mr. Booth: But you know we can make them.

Mr. William Redmond: Mr. Parker, will you ask Mr. Maxse whether he received, in any of the confidential letters, which he has not produced, any evidence which satisfied his mind that there was any truth or ground for the statements that Ministers were gambling?

Mr. James Parker (to the Witness): *Q.* You have heard the question? *A.* Yes. Unless I had been satisfied by the enquiries I made that there was, at any rate, strong ground for suspicion——

Mr. William Redmond: *Q.* I said "evidence"? *A.* We have not got the evidence; I have not had access to people's pass-books.

Mr. James Parker: Q. Give your own answer? *A.* Unless I had been satisfied that there was strong ground for suspicion I, of course, should not have entered upon this affair.

Q. I want to follow that up a little. You say unless you had had evidence? *A.* I did not say evidence.

Q. Well, unless you had been satisfied that there was strong ground for suspicion, you would not have followed up this affair in your articles in the *National Review*. What are your grounds for suspicion? *A.* My grounds for suspicion are that everybody whom I had consulted upon this question has somehow or other acquired the idea that there was gambling in Marconi shares, and that among the gamblers in Marconi shares have been members of the present Government. I am struck by the fact that from the month of July, when I began my enquiries, up to the present day, I have always been told the same thing, and the same Ministers have generally been mentioned in this connection.

Q. But you will not tell us who told you? *A.* I am not going to give you the names of people with whom I had private correspondence or conversation.

Q. Neither will you tell us what they told you? *A.* I will only tell you that they told me that particular Ministers—it was generally a particular group of Ministers—were believed to have participated in this gamble, and the thing was very generally believed in the City, and the City, I believe, continue to believe it. They may be quite wrong. If I may be allowed to refer to it, I think the case is very fairly stated in the *National Review*, and I have come here to justify it.

Q. I am coming to the articles in the *National Review* presently, but for the moment let us keep to the question. This Committee has been striving, in spite of what you say in the *National Review*, to get at some facts. We are out searching for facts, and the only way to obtain those facts is from witnesses who come before us? *A.* Or to get Ministers here.

Q. We will deal with that point. I am coming to that question at a later stage of my examination, but in the meantime I am dealing with such knowledge or such information as you can give us. All that you can give us is, so far as I understand, that you heard these rumours, that you wrote to certain people and that they supplied you with information? *A.* And I have talked to a great many people.

Q. When you wrote to certain people they supplied you with certain information which you say you cannot or will not disclose,

and therefore you have not a single fact that you can place before this Committee to substantiate the suggestion that Ministers were connected with this corrupt activity on the Stock Exchange? *A.* I have not what would be regarded by lawyers as evidence, and I have never pretended to have evidence. I have called attention in the *National Review*—and that is the position that I maintain here—to the fact that owing to the circumstances under which this contract was negotiated, legitimate suspicions were aroused which have been persisted in from that day to this, and that owing to their own conduct and attitude—the attitude particularly of the Postmaster-General—their names have been brought into this affair, and there is a widespread belief held, rightly or wrongly, that Ministers participated in the gamble. That is not a charge of corruption, and I am not going to have the word "corruption" put upon me.

Mr. Falconer: But you have not answered Mr. Parker's question.

Mr. James Parker: *Q.* There is no intention on the part of any member of the Committee to put anything upon you? *A.* Attempts have been made to put things upon Mr. Lawson.

Q. It is not your business here to defend Mr. Lawson, but to look after yourself? *A.* I am going to do so.

Q. I am going to try to put nothing upon you, but I will endeavour to meet you on the remarks you made yourself in your own précis, and on those things which you yourself have written in the *National Review*, and I am going to endeavour to find out what facts you have to substantiate the statement, and if you can assist me in doing so I shall be delighted. If you cannot, then I shall know what value to place upon your statements? *A.* I have suggested to you a way to settle the whole thing, that is to get Ministers to come here and make a statement on oath.

Q. You will not get away from it with that? *A.* I do not want to get away from anything.

Q. We will deal with that when the proper time arrives. Up to now you have no definite fact to put before us which substantiates, in any degree, the wild statements that you yourself have made in the précis of your evidence, and in the *National Review*? *A.* I have made no wild statements. I have called attention

to the fact that an unprecedented Stock Exchange gamble was allowed to go on while a Government Department was engaged in negotiations with a speculative company.

Q. I understand you to say you base practically all your charges upon what was laid down by Mr. Lawson in the articles which he wrote? *A.* Certainly not.

Q. You have information apart from Mr. Lawson? *A.* I have told you I have made enquiries on my own account quite apart from Mr. Lawson, and I always had the same answer.

Q. Mr. Lawson's reputation, I understood you to say in your précis of your evidence, was relied upon by you? *A.* I relied upon Mr. Lawson as a writer. I did not think of him as a witness.

Q. But you relied upon the facts which he put before you, and which were published in your journal? *A.* The statements that Mr. Lawson published in the *National Review* coincided with the statements I had heard otherwise, as regards that particular aspect of the case. On the technical business part of it on which he wrote, I of course was an amateur.

Q. You do not suggest that Mr. Lawson was any the less honourable because when closely questioned he saw fit to withdraw most of what he had stated? *A.* I think Mr. Lawson is by temperament unfitted to be a witness.

Q. Possibly Mr. Lawson might have the same opinion of you? *A.* Quite; he may be justified.

Q. At the bottom of page 1 of your précis you make a statement with regard to the "impenetrable secrecy of Ministers." I will read the whole passage: "Among the extraordinary features of the affair which impressed every one who went into it was the amazing gamble in the shares of a company engaged in confidential negotiations with the British Government, which indicated leakage from one quarter or another. Then there was the impenetrable secrecy of Ministers, and the evasive answers returned to all enquiries in the House of Commons, whether from Ministerial or Opposition benches." What is the particular secrecy to which you refer there? Were you alluding to the fact that the House of Commons was not definitely informed while the agreement was in negotiation? *A.* What I was, of course, referring to was the fact that the agreement of March 7, which, according to the

Attorney-General, was a definite contract, and as we have now seen——

Mr. Falconer: Q. He did not say anything about it being "definite"? A. I shall only be too pleased to read precisely what the Attorney-General said about it in the House of Commons on October 11.

Q. Did he say it was a definite contract? A. I do not know what you mean by the word "definite."

Q. Did he use the word "definite" with regard to it? A. He spoke of it very definitely as a contract.

Q. There are definite contracts and conditional contracts? A. May I be allowed to read it. I would like to justify it. On page 713 of the Official Report Sir Rufus Isaacs says: "I have never discussed from beginning to end the making of this contract, with my right honourable friend the Postmaster-General, and I never knew that there was such a contract"—it is always "contract" in the Attorney-General's mouth—"in contemplation until a few days before, when I was told at a private social function, by the managing director of the Company, who is my brother, that he did hope to get a contract with the Government, and was in negotiation with them for it. That was a few days before I saw the announcement in the papers that there had, in fact, been a contract accepted." To a layman like me the authority of the Attorney-General is conclusive.

Mr. Mooney: Will you read on?

Mr. Falconer: "That is the only thing I heard in connection with this matter, and the first intimation to me that the contract had been got, that this tender had been accepted, that the Company had made it, was in a circular or some announcement in the Press, which appeared on either the 7th or 8th March, immediately after the correspondence which is before the House, and to which reference was made to-day."

Mr. George Faber: Read the next sentence. "That is the beginning and end of my connection with all the negotiation or completion of this contract. I have never been consulted," &c.

Mr. William Redmond: I do not see why it should not be all read down to the end.

Mr. James Parker: I do not object to it being read.

Witness: I would like to read all of it. I think it is admirable.

Mr. Falconer : *Q*. To clear this up, because it has been used several times, so far as I can see in what you have read there is nothing to suggest that the Attorney-General described the acceptance of the tender as what you call a "definite contract," and it is desirable to be very accurate about this because a tender accepted such as this is may be merely a conditional contract and that of course is very different from a definite or final contract ? *A*. But he did not describe it as a "conditional contract," but as a "contract." To a layman like me the Attorney-General's description of a particular thing as a "contract" is surely sufficient.

Q. That is perfectly true, but you put into the mouth of the Attorney-General the words "definite contract." You said, as I understood you—if I misunderstood you let it be put right—that the Attorney-General described the acceptance of the tender as a "definite contract" ? *A*. In my précis I put "contract" in inverted commas.

Q. I want it to be accurate ? *A*. I would like to have it down as "contract," the word "contract" is repeated several times.

Mr. James Parker : *Q*. And it is that, and that alone, which caused you to say in your précis that there was this impenetrable secrecy of Ministers ? *A*. Not in the least. It was the attitude of the Postmaster-General in the House of Commons.

Q. Do you think a Minister of the Crown, or anybody occupying a position on any public authority, should take into consultation necessarily the whole body of that authority, if he is acting with the cognisance of his executive government, or, if it was the case of a corporation, with his committee. Should he take the whole nation into his confidence before his negotiation is final and complete ? *A*. I think, if I may be allowed to answer that question, that on March 7 the Postmaster-General should have gone down to the House of Commons and said : "We have to-day entered into an agreement with the Marconi Company of such and such a character. During the negotiations for this agreement I have been deprived of the services of the Attorney-General because of his relationship with the managing director of the Marconi Company, and in view of the great gamble that has been taking place during these negotiations——"

Mr. Booth : We do not want that ? *A*. I am giving a very definite answer.

Mr. James Parker: *Q.* Yes, surely? *A.* "And in view of the gamble that has taken place during these negotiations, I propose that this agreement shall not be ratified until it has been submitted to a Select Committee of the House of Commons, and I also want to warn the public against the gambling that is going on in these shares."

(*After a short adjournment.*)

Mr. Mooney: On a point of order before we proceed I want to have an answer which was given by the witness read out by the shorthand writer. I understand the witness has stated that he had in his possession correspondence and information which satisfied him that there were grounds for the allegations he had made in his articles, but that he considers such correspondence is confidential and refuses to disclose it to the Committee. Has not this Committee "Power to send for persons, papers, and documents," and is not the refusal of the witness to disclose evidence to this Committee on which he has acted a breach of the privilege of this Committee, and I ask that the witness should be directed to give the information to the Committee.

Lord Robert Cecil: I ask for the room to be cleared.

(*The Committee Room was cleared, and after a short time the public were again admitted.*)

Chairman (to the Witness): *Q.* Have you any letters or copies of letters bearing on the rumours that Ministers were financially interested in any of the Marconi companies? *A.* I do not know whether I have any letters at the present time; but, if I had any letters, it would not be possible for me to produce them, because they are confidential, and editorial discretion would prevent my giving away my correspondents.

Q. Then you decline to produce them? *A.* Yes, I decline.

Q. You have not destroyed them, have you? *A.* I think I probably have destroyed them to some extent.

Mr. Falconer: *Q.* What do you mean by that? *A.* I have not looked recently. There might be some still in existence, but I do not keep correspondence as a general rule.

Q. I did not hear your answer. Is it this: That there are some letters you have destroyed and there are some that you have not destroyed? *A.* I think probably that is the case.

Chairman: *Q.* Will you produce those you have? *A.* No.

Q. Will you state the names of the writers, the contents of the letters, and the names of any persons who are mentioned in the letters? *A.* No.

Q. Will you state the purport of any verbal communication you have had on the above subjects, with the names of those with whom you have communicated? *A.* I cannot mention the names of people with whom I have communicated, but I have no objection to state the purport of what I have been told.

Q. But you decline to mention the names? *A.* Certainly.

Lord Robert Cecil: *Q.* The Committee wish me to ask you why it is that you refuse to produce these letters or to give the other information that we have asked for? *A.* The reason is because the position of an editor depends on his inspiring confidence in the people with whom he has confidential communications, and it would be quite impossible for me to carry on my business if any one had reason to suppose the communications made to me would be repeated either before a Committee of the House of Commons or any other body.

Mr. James Parker: I think this question should be put, but any Member of the Committee can object. Are you aware that this Committee has power to enforce the production of these things?

Lord Robert Cecil: No, we have not.

Chairman: We have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Mr. James Parker: I think Mr. Maxse ought to know that before he definitely decides not to give the information asked for.

Lord Robert Cecil (to the Witness): *Q.* I will put it in this way. Are you aware that it would be within the power of this Committee to report your refusal to the House for the House to take any action they like? *A.* I am quite aware of that.

Mr. Falconer: *Q.* There is only one question I want to make quite clear. I understand that you referred to the enquiries that you made and the communications which you had as to a certain extent justifying the comment contained in your paper upon the conduct of Ministers? *A.* Yes.

(The Committee Room was cleared, and after a short time the public were again admitted.)

Chairman (to the Witness): The Committee propose to pass this resolution, but we are anxious that you should hear it first, so that if you have anything to say you shall have the opportunity of saying it. This is the resolution: "That the Chairman do report to the House that Mr. Maxse, a witness before this Committee, has refused to give information in his possession and to produce letters asked for by the Committee, which, in the opinion of the Committee, should be laid before them."

Mr. Douglas Hogg: I think perhaps it would be convenient if you will allow me that I, rather than Mr. Maxse, should say what is to be said. What I have to say is this: There are two points which I want to make. One is with regard to the nature of the communications which Mr. Maxse has refused to disclose, and the second is with regard to the reasons which induce him to refuse to disclose them, because, I think, those are both relevant matters that this Committee should take into consideration before they pass a resolution of the character which you, Sir, have just communicated. First of all, with regard to the nature of the information which Mr. Maxse has refused to disclose, as I understand, Mr. Maxse says this: Before I published those articles in the *National Review* I made enquiries from various sources, and the result of those enquiries was to satisfy me, not that the rumours which were prevalent were well-founded, but that the rumours were prevalent, and that there was a case to be enquired into; and I published the articles in that view and with that object, and to that view I adhere. Now the Committee is appointed, as I understand it, not to enquire whether or not rumours existed as to the Cabinet Ministers or as to any one else —I am not dealing, of course, with the question as to the advisability of the agreement—but to enquire into whether or not there was a foundation for these charges.

Mr. William Redmond: To enquire into all the circumstances.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: I submit that that is an enquiry in which the Committee will not in any way be assisted by being told the persons who gave Mr. Maxse information—not information which showed that the rumours were well-founded, but that they existed. So, first of all, I say the question which he declines to answer—which are as to the names of his informants—and the documents which he refuses to produce—which are the

communications he received—is not information and are not documents which would assist this Committee in its deliberations. I admit at once that that is a matter for the Committee to determine and not for Mr. Maxse, but I am submitting that consideration for the Committee to think over before they finally pass this resolution.

Lord Robert Cecil : Would it be convenient for me to make an observation to you?

Mr. Douglas Hogg : I should be very much obliged.

Lord Robert Cecil : Have you before you the terms of our reference? If you have the debate they are at the beginning of the debate in Column 663.

Mr. Douglas Hogg : Yes, I have them now.

Lord Robert Cecil : You will see that we are appointed to investigate the circumstances connected with the negotiation and completion of the agreement.

Mr. Douglas Hogg : I am much obliged to you; it is even more limited than I realised when I was speaking.

Lord Robert Cecil : I am suggesting to you that it is a good deal wider.

Mr. Douglas Hogg : It is for the Committee to decide, and not for me.

Lord Robert Cecil : I am merely anxious to hear your view.

Mr. Douglas Hogg : I suggest that the meaning of that is that the Committee has to investigate the circumstances connected with the negotiation and completion—that is to say, what the facts were which happened with regard to that negotiation and that completion. If I may take such a question as the rumours which have been prevalent—of course, the Committee will understand I am not suggesting there is any foundation for them at all, but merely using it by way of illustration, because it is a point about which Mr. Maxse was being asked—whether or not people in the City were saying that this, that, or the other Cabinet Minister was making a profit is not a matter which helps the Committee in arriving at any decision as to the circumstances.

Lord Robert Cecil : No, but if the rumours were true, and if it were true that a Cabinet Minister, or any other Minister, were making a profit, that would be a very material matter for us to investigate.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: Most material.

Lord Robert Cecil: How are we to get at that unless we get at the people who say they heard rumours? The rumours must have started somewhere. Our only way is to trace back the rumours to their original foundation.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: I suggest the people who know the facts upon which the rumours are founded are the people the Committee ought to have before it. People who merely repeated them to Mr. Maxse are not the people who can say.

Lord Robert Cecil: If we could get that, we might get a stage in the way back to determine the origin of the rumour.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: I suggest that is a hopeless task.

Mr. Falconer: The witness has given evidence that the information which he received, and declines to disclose, satisfied him that they were grounds for suspicion, and upon the strength of that he wrote his articles publishing these rumours, or whatever charges he has made in his articles. It is really for the Committee, but I put it to you that if we are told that the witness has information which will disclose grounds of suspicion, is not that the very thing we are here to get at?

Mr. Douglas Hogg: I think the answer is that the witness has not refused, and, as I understand, does not refuse to give you the purport of the information which he got which he considered constituted grounds for suspicion.

Mr. Falconer: I do not want to get into an argument about it but merely put it so that you may have, so far as you are concerned, the reasons for which I think it important that we should search this out to the very bottom. We can make no enquiry unless we have not only the purport of the rumours, but the persons who have the information which was conveyed to the witness upon which he based his statement.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: I should have submitted to the Committee until they know what the purport of the information is they cannot be in a position to offer an opinion as to whether or not the name of the person who gave it is material or helpful.

Mr. Mooney: Mr. Maxse has definitely refused to give the Committee the information which he thought was good. The Committee desire to be put in possession of it and he refuses to give it.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: Of course, it will be in your recollection, as well as on the Note, but I think the last two questions which the Chairman asked Mr. Maxse were: Would he give the names of the people who had communicated with him and the purport of their communication? Mr. Maxse said, "I will give the purport of the communication but I will not give the names." I think I am right and it is on that hypothesis I base my argument.

Mr. William Redmond: Mr. Hogg, you know very well that a suggestion has been made, quite openly almost, in many quarters that this contract was given to the Marconi Company because certain Ministers were interested in that Company. We have had many rumours without any names or particulars being given as to whether Ministers were or were not interested in this Company. Mr. Maxse for the first time has given us something tangible to go on. He has told us that he had letters from certain people regarding these rumours, and that he has the names of those people that he consulted. Our object being to enquire perfectly fully as to the truth, or otherwise, of those rumours, we ask Mr. Maxse to give us the names and the letters of the people who communicated with him upon which these rumours were circulated in his journal. That is our position. We want to get at the truth of all these things.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: I quite appreciate that, and may I say the answer I make to that is that Mr. Maxse has not refused at present, as I understand it, to give the purport of the information which he had and which he says justified him in writing the articles which he wrote. But what he says is: "I am not prepared to give you the names of the people from whom I got that information." I am suggesting to the Committee that at present, without knowing what that information is, they cannot judge whether the names of those persons would be of any assistance at all. That is what I have to say about the first point. The second point I want to discuss is the reason why Mr. Maxse refuses. That is a matter which I submit to this Committee is a matter of very grave public importance, because the position which Mr. Maxse adopts, as I understand, is this: He is the editor of a journal, and as such editor he receives from time to time communications from all classes and kinds of people of a confidential character, which are made to him as an editor, because the people

who communicate know they can rely upon his honour not to commit any breach of confidence by betraying either the information or its source. It is given to him in confidence, and on the strict understanding and in the strict belief that Mr. Maxse, as an editor, will adhere to the standard of honour to which I am glad to think that editors of the Press always have adhered, and will not betray the names of people who communicate with him in confidence. Now, this Committee is asking him to commit a direct breach of that duty, and I do submit to this Committee that it is not a fair thing to ask a witness on oath to give information which he cannot give without breaking the duty which he owes to the people who gave him the information, and without breaking the traditions of the Press, and the standard of honour which he, as an editor, feels bound to maintain. I do ask the Committee very seriously to consider whether it is a fair thing to tell the House of Commons that Mr. Maxse has refused to give information, when what he has really done is to say, not "I will not give information contumaciously because I do not respect the Committee, and do not recognise their authority," but he has said quite respectfully, "I cannot give this information, because I cannot do it without doing a thing which no honourable man would do or ought to do, and which, I submit to this Committee, no honourable man ought to be asked to do. I got the information and names of these people in confidence; and I respectfully say to this Committee: 'You, Sir, have no right to ask me to tell you a thing which I cannot tell you without breaking the confidence of the person from whom I received the information, and the duty which I owe to that person.'" Now that is the ground and the sole ground which Mr. Maxse takes up, and I do ask this Committee not to say that anybody who has a confidential communication made to him on the terms that the confidence shall not be violated, is to be compelled by this Committee, because it wishes to get it out in the course of evidence, to violate that confidence. Take an illustration: Supposing somebody writes to a newspaper a letter which is anonymous, and sends his card with the letter, say, to the *Times* or some perfectly reputable journal, and the *Times* publishes it, would it be a fair thing afterwards to say to the editor of the *Times*: "We will report you for a breach of the privilege of this House

if you will not tell us who was the person who wrote that anonymous letter"? An editor is bound to take, and does take, the responsibility for what he publishes.

Mr. Mooney: Supposing an article which is libellous is published in the paper, and the editor of that paper is taken into Court and asked to disclose the name of his writer, what does the Court do if he refuses to give the name?

Mr. Douglas Hogg: I think the Court would not compel him to give the name if he accepted the responsibility.

Mr. Mooney: Are you aware that the Court sends him to prison for contempt of Court?

Mr. Douglas Hogg: I do not think the Court would do that.

Mr. Mooney: I will give you an instance if you like.

Lord Robert Cecil: In the case put by Mr. Mooney it might be said that it was not a material question to the issue before the Court. But supposing it was a material issue: supposing the charge was against the man and there was very good reason to believe he had written the letter and the editor was called and asked to say whether he had or had not written the letter and he refused to say, do you say the Court would not compel him to answer? Would he have any legal ground for refusing?

Mr. Douglas Hogg: Are you dealing now with a criminal case?

Lord Robert Cecil: Either criminal or civil.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: In a civil case where an editor takes the responsibility for the libel and is sued for it I think generally the Court is content to leave it at that.

Lord Robert Cecil: But you are not taking my case: Action against a man who writes to the newspaper anonymously. There is a certain amount of evidence that he was the author of the letter. The editor is called and asked to say whether he was in fact the person who wrote. That is a case where it is directly material to the issue to know whether he was the man who wrote or not.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: If it were directly material and there was no privilege recognised by the law, then I think the name would have to be disclosed. But you have to take both those assumptions.

Lord Robert Cecil: But there is no privilege recognised by the law in this case.

Mr. Douglas Hogg : No privilege recognised by the law, but we are not quite a merely legal tribunal.

Lord Robert Cecil : That is another matter.

Mr. Douglas Hogg : There is the privilege recognised by the standard of honour of honourable men, and I ask this Committee, consisting of honourable members, not to ask Mr. Maxse to violate that privilege.

Mr. William Redmond : This is a case of dishonourable charges against three Cabinet Ministers. Where does any honour come in where there is concealment?

Mr. Booth : You are aware that we are calling many witnesses. Could not every witness—every journalistic witness and each banker and stockbroker—decline to give the Committee the information we are seeking for on the same ground you are now advancing?

Mr. Douglas Hogg : No, I should say not, if it were a stockbroker.

Mr. Booth : Take the case of a banker.

Mr. Douglas Hogg : Take the case of a banker. Although a banker, of course, ordinarily cannot disclose his customers' accounts, if he is ordered to do so by a Court of Law he commonly does. He is not there giving the name of his customer in confidence.

Mr. Booth : That is not quite my point.

Mr. Douglas Hogg : That is the distinction I draw. In this case it is the name of the writer, or the name of the person giving the information, which is sought, and that is the very fact which is only obtained in confidence.

Mr. Booth : I will put my point again. I am dealing now with all witnesses who will come—supposing they all take the line of your client—and say to us when we are in search of something definite : "This was given to me in confidence; it will be a breach of faith to give it." Can you see any object in our continuing to sit?

Mr. Douglas Hogg : On that part of the case, no; but I cannot see any analogy between the two positions, because I am trying to point out that in the case of the banker or stockbroker it is not the confidential fact that is communicated.

Mr. Booth : We have a lot of journalists to come. I want you

to realise that when we come to a decision on this point, it is of greater importance than your client's position, because it affects every subsequent witness, and our decision may not be so much personal as with a view to our general procedure. Your client is one of those who has pressed upon the Committee the need for thorough investigation, and he himself wants us to examine the pass-books and secret documents of bankers.

Mr. Douglas Hogg : Certainly.

Mr. George Faber : I understand you do draw the specific distinction you have just given in this room between the case of an editor and the owner of a paper being asked to disclose names and the case of bankers or stockbrokers.

Mr. Douglas Hogg : Quite so, because in the case of the editor, the name is the very fact which is communicated to him in confidence. You are asking him directly to break the condition under which he got the name, which is a totally different thing.

Lord Robert Cecil : One further point: Supposing merely for the sake of illustrating what I am going to say that it were really true that a Minister of the Crown had been engaged in nefarious practices of this kind, and we got the man who could really tell us and who was his agent in doing it, could you imagine a greater position of confidence than that? Would not he be absolutely bound not to say a word about it to us, and should not we be bound to press him, and, if necessary, report him to the House?

Mr. Douglas Hogg : Certainly; he may be an accomplice in the case you put.

Lord Robert Cecil : Quite so; but he may not have known at the time he was the accomplice.

Mr. Falconer : This troubles my mind very much. All the considerations of honour and otherwise which you have suggested were very proper considerations for Mr. Maxse to take into account before he published charges on the strength of this information; but surely not when a man takes on himself the responsibility of making charges on the strength of certain information and comes here and says, that information justified it to a certain extent, especially when you are dealing with a situation where he cannot, except in the most formal and nominal manner, take the responsibilities, because he cannot take any

part of the responsibility in connection with these charges to clear the character of Ministers or others who may be concerned.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: I think the answer is that Mr. Maxse neither in his paper nor in his evidence has taken upon himself the burden of making charges. What he said in his evidence, and I think in his paper, is, that rumours were prevalent in all directions, and the rumours being prevalent, and remaining so long prevalent, under the circumstances he thought it a case that ought to be enquired into, and that Ministers ought to be called upon for an answer.

Mr. Falconer: The words I used were that he had published certain charges. That was the point I wanted to put to you.

Mr. James Parker: As this arose really out of certain questions I put to Mr. Maxse, let me put this point: Mr. Maxse is desirous that this Committee should get out the truth with regard to this matter. He is in possession of certain things that would help this Committee in getting at the truth. Therefore I submit that the Committee is fully justified in the resolution which it is desiring to come to, and I do not think we ought to argue this question at length at all. We have heard what Mr. Douglas Hogg has to say, but we have asked for certain information. Mr. Maxse states he has got that information or some of it, but declines to give it. He puts the onus upon this Committee to prove certain things. He says he has got that which will help, but he deliberately withholds it from the Committee.

Chairman: I have been listening to this discussion simply as a layman. You are very tenacious of the honour of Mr. Maxse, but you seem entirely to have forgotten the honour of the public men who are implicated in the rumours that Mr. Maxse has been circulating broadcast, and yet when we come to examine into it and when he has been goading us on and implying that we were not going to examine into this case fully, he declines to give us any real foundation by declining to give us the names or the letters of those who have spread about these rumours with regard to our public men, of whom we are justly proud in this country.

Mr. Douglas Hogg: I have tried to put Mr. Maxse's view about that clearly.

Chairman: We shall not continue the evidence of Mr. Maxse this afternoon, and the room will be cleared.

II. A WORD FOR THE MARCONI COMMITTEE

I am reluctant to add anything to the Special Report of the Marconi Committee, which, if I may be allowed to say so without any breach of privilege, performed a conspicuous public service in circulating this document as a Parliamentary Paper with the Orders of the Day, which necessarily brought it under the immediate notice of the Representatives of the People who were thereby deprived of all shadow of excuse for ignoring its contents. Obscure persons like myself had for many months, in season and out of season, been endeavouring to arouse public interest in a complicated and fascinating problem but without excessive success. Amid the crush of public events, and the stale and jaded condition of Parliamentarians, to say nothing of the surfeit of ever-increasing sensations surging round every newspaper office, it was difficult to secure adequate attention for a topic which touches many aspects of public life and affords a veritable eye-opener to the possibilities of the present régime.

In fact, putting all personal issues rigorously on one side, I cannot help feeling that some injustice has been done to the Marconi Committee in connection with this particular incident, and I would cheerfully break a friendly lance on their behalf. According to the *Daily News*, *Freeman's Journal*, and the *Nation*, which are all passionate partisans, and inclined, if not determined, to believe evil of every Unionist, the action of the Marconi Committee in issuing this Special Report, and in reporting a recalcitrant witness for refusing to betray those who had trusted him, was "unanimous," and much capital has been made out of that fact in circles where charity is cultivated on a little cocoa. I have no knowledge on this matter, the Unionist members of the Committee being much too discreet and decorous to discuss quasi judicial questions abroad, and I am quite willing to take the word of contemporaries who claim to be "in the know." In the happy event of the Special Report being "unanimous" one can not only eliminate the purely personal element, but likewise the element

of party prejudice, and for once a public question may be discussed exclusively on its merits.

Hard measure has been meted out to the Marconi Committee, and though much feeling has been aroused by their recent action on the eve of the adjournment of Parliament, I can honestly say that I regard them without any vestige of rancour, and can sympathise to some extent with the awkward dilemma in which they have been placed by the force of circumstances. They are good men struggling with adversity and trying to do their best in impossible conditions. Every allowance should be made for them, but the public have not made sufficient allowance because outsiders have no conception of the tremendous handicap under which a Committee of Private Members or rank and filers—whichever may be the correct designation—labour under in investigating questions directly affecting the position of "the great, wise and eminent men" who occupy and adorn the Front Benches. Until one heard the awestruck tones in which members of the Committee spoke of *Cabinet Ministers* as gods too great to be seen by mortal eye, one never appreciated the true proportions of the portentous hierarchy which dominates and paralyses Parliament and reduces every other element to a nullity.

No Russian ikon is the object of more abject worship than your "Cabinet Minister," whichever party may be in power, and the genuine grief depicted on the countenances of politicians reputed independent at the discovery that the *National Review* had described our unsophisticated Attorney-General, Sir Rufus Isaacs—a celebrity on his own account, as also on account of his intimate relationship with Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the hypnotic Managing Director of Marconi Company—as a "Cabinet Minister" two or three months before he entered the charmed circle would not have been believed had it not been seen. It may be doubted whether one man in a hundred away from Westminster could name more than four or five Cabinet Ministers at the very outside, or has the faintest notion whether the Attorney-General is or is not in the Cabinet, nor is the matter of the slightest public importance. But to the meticulous mind of the professional politician such trivialities loom large, and it is only by living in his atmosphere, by adopting his standpoint, and placing oneself in his position that one can even begin to appreciate the difficulties besetting the Marconi Committee. It has been stated by several

newspapers—and I would not venture to pry into such high matters—that Mr. Asquith and his colleagues were angry with the Marconi Committee for "reporting" a witness to the Speaker and, so to speak, making a mountain out of a molehill. But have not the Marconi Committee every reason to be angry with Mr. Asquith's colleagues for not reporting themselves to the Marconi Committee, in fulfilment of a clear and categorical pledge given on behalf of the Government to the House of Commons so long ago as October 11, 1912, *i.e.* nearly five months? As public memory is short and Ministers have no memory at all, I make no apology for recurring to this undertaking because it is the crux of the whole business, and its non-fulfilment is exclusively responsible for the present impasse. It would appear that such time as Mr. Herbert Samuel, the Postmaster-General, can spare from the neglect of his official duties he devotes to misleading the House of Commons. Mr. Samuel opened his "triumphant vindication" of his Marconi mad policy with the following bluster (*see* Official Report pp. 721 and 722): "I confess that, after reading for months past allegations, insinuations, attacks, accusations of mal-administration and favouritism, and even worse, it is to me a profound relief now to be able to stand at this table in the light of day and give an answer to these assertions."

It all sounded very brave at the time but scarcely a sentence of Mr. Samuel's "triumphant vindication" would bear scrutiny to-day, and his ardour to stand at the table on October 11 bears a striking contrast to his supineness in the interval. All the more so as the Marconi Committee are now in possession, at any rate, of the case for the Post Office, and the records of official ineptitude would be searched in vain for anything parallel to the crass incompetence of the Department which negotiated the Agreement of March 7 and concealed it from the public until the end of July, on the pretext that it was not an Agreement. Mr. Samuel shall speak for himself, for unless one gave his *verba ipsissima* as recorded in the Official Report of Parliamentary Debates, one could not expect people to believe that a Minister could indulge in such quibbling and preserve a shred of respect. Sir Henry Norman, in opening the Debate (October 11, 1912) said:

On March 7 the Postmaster-General signed an Agreement with Marconi's Wireless Company for the erection of six wireless stations.

Mr. Herbert Samuel: There is no Agreement.

Sir H. Norman: I will adopt whatever word the Postmaster-General chooses. He approved and signed a Contract.

Mr. Herbert Samuel: No, Sir. I signed no Contract. The Marconi Company put in a Tender in general terms. A letter was written by the Post Office accepting the Tender, upon which a Contract was subsequently to be based.

Sir H. Norman: I will make myself entirely safe by saying that the Postmaster-General signed a document.

Mr. Herbert Samuel: Somebody wrote a letter.

Sir H. Norman: Really, if I may respectfully say so, that is rather a quibble. Some document committing the Post Office and therefore the British Government to the erection of these wireless stations, subject to the ratification of this House, was signed by somebody on March 7 on behalf of the Postmaster-General.

Mr. Herbert Samuel: There was no Contract.

The reader should scan this passage very carefully and compare it with the quotation from Sir Rufus Isaacs' speech of the same day quoted on a previous page of the Special Report of the Select Committee, which for convenience is reproduced here. Mr. Herbert Samuel told the House of Commons "There is no Agreement." Again, "There was no Contract." Listen to the Attorney-General (Sir Rufus Isaacs), who is at least as great an authority on contracts as the Postmaster-General, who is we believe one of the few members of the present Cabinet who is not a lawyer. Sir Rufus Isaacs was engaged in clearing himself of the "insinuation" "that some person has used his influence to obtain a Contract for the Marconi Company with the Government, or has in some way acted to the advantage of the Marconi Company in the negotiations which took place with reference to this Contract." Note the constant use of the word "Contract." Note again the date of the Contract, because the Attorney-General went on to say: "I never have discussed from beginning to end, the making of this Contract with my right hon. friend the Postmaster General, and I never knew there was such a Contract in contemplation until a few days before, when I was told at a private social function by the Managing Director of the Company, who is my brother, that he did hope to get a Contract with the Government, and was in negotiation with them for it." We attach great importance to this passage as showing the disingenuousness with which Mr. Herbert Samuel has habitually treated the House of Commons throughout this deplorable affair, and it argues small self-respect in any Legislative Assembly that it should

acquiesce in such treatment. As we have seen, Mr. Herbert Samuel interrupted Sir Henry Norman to say "There is no Agreement," and "There was no Contract." As the context shows, he was referring to March 7, as was also the Attorney-General, who in the speech already quoted, goes on to say that his conversation with his brother, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, in which the latter expressed the hope that he would "get a Contract with the Government," was on the eve of the Agreement or Contract of March 7. We again recur to the Official Report. "That was a few days before I (Sir Rufus Isaacs) saw the announcement in the papers that there had, in fact, been a Contract accepted. That is the only thing I heard in connection with this matter, and the first intimation to me that the Contract had been got—that this tender had been accepted, that the Company had made it—was in a circular or some announcement in the Press, which appeared on either March 7 or 8." So the Attorney-General realised that "the Contract had been got" on March 7 or 8. But the Postmaster General could inform the House of Commons on October 11 that there was neither Contract nor Agreement at that date. We ask in the face of such statements, which by no means stand alone (because the Postmaster-General's attitude has been one long equivocation throughout this affair), what precise value attaches to Ministerial statements in the House of Commons where they are not speaking on oath.

I will give yet another Samuelism which has struck every one who has noted it. It was set forth in the last number of the *National Review*, but there can be no harm in repeating it as it gives us an invaluable insight into the mind of cynical Ministers and the morals of the Parliamentary game. It would be interesting to have the candid opinion of the Coalition members of the Select Committee upon this particular Samuelism, as also that of the Cocoa Press, who would be more profitably employed in examining the grave position into which Ministers have drifted than in the daily manipulation of their gutter squirts. Realising that that monument of constructive statesmanship, the Marconi Agreement, might be in jeopardy in the event of the appointment of a committee of independent and scientific experts, Mr. Herbert Samuel exhausted all his arts and artifices on January 13 to dissuade the Select Committee from adopting this proposal to

which they inclined. He raised every possible and impossible obstacle and ended with this piteous appeal:

I foresee the greatest possible difficulty in selecting the individuals to form this Committee, if it is to be independent both of the Government and all the various wireless systems, and is at the same time to consist of men who are really experts in wireless telegraphy, whose opinion would carry the greatest authority. I do not know whether the Committee have in their mind any particular names, but if so I shall be very glad indeed to consider them *should the Committee propose to go on with this proposition* (my italics), but for my part, after consulting with others, I can only say that the selection of such a Committee would be a task of the most formidable magnitude.

To the surprise of every one the Committee refused to be bluffed even by a Cabinet Minister, and presented a Report advising *inter alia* that "The Government appoint a Scientific Committee as indicated above." On January 15, two days after this frantic effort to prevent its appointment, Sir Albert Spicer (Chairman of the Marconi Committee) asked the Postmaster-General what the Government proposed to do as regards the suggestion of the Select Committee, and Mr. Herbert Samuel actually had the effrontery to tell an ignorant House of Commons, which has little leisure to follow the proceedings of Committees upstairs that "These recommendations, in their present form, substantially meet the representations *which were made to the Committee on behalf of the Government* [my italics], and the Government will be glad to give immediate effect to them."

I could go on, but possibly by this time the reader is weary of Mr. Herbert Samuel's "terminological inexactitudes," which are, however, germane to the present controversy where Ministerial credit, character, accuracy and truthfulness are involved. In his speech last October, which was lauded sky-high by the Coalition Press, and which even imposed on some Unionist organs, Mr. Herbert Samuel declared *ore rotundo* that he would like

in the first instance, to confirm in unqualified terms what has been said on his own behalf by my right hon and learned friend the Attorney-General, and I can do it not only on my own behalf, but on that of every member of the Cabinet. I say that these stories that Members of the Cabinet, knowing that the Contract was in contemplation, and feeling that possibly the prices of shares might rise, themselves, directly or indirectly, bought any of those shares or took any interest in this Company or in any part of it whatever, have not one syllable of truth in them. Neither I myself nor any of my colleagues have at any time held one shilling's worth of shares in this Company, directly or indirectly, or have derived one penny profit from the fluctuations in their prices.

This doubtless sounded conclusive at the moment to the unthinking,

but on reflection people asked themselves what was the value of the Postmaster-General's assurances so far as regards indirect dealings—and dealings are more likely in this case to have been indirect than direct—on the part of his colleagues or their connections. It was also noted that he spoke of "this Company," but the prolific parent has many offspring, and some of the most shameless gambles have taken place in the shares of the offspring, which rocketed sky-high on account of the arrangement between the Marconi Company and the British Post Office of March 7, although it was neither an Agreement nor a Contract according to the Postmaster-General. I must add in this connection that Sir Rufus Isaacs, the Attorney-General, who has a well-deserved reputation for accuracy to maintain, unwittingly misled the House of Commons in the debate of October 11 when he stated that his famous telegram, which by common consent was an unfortunate episode in a distinguished career, could have had no effect on the boom in Marconi shares as it was sent after that boom was over. The text of that telegram will be found on a previous page of the Special Report of the Select Committee, and it was somewhat striking that Radical newspapers, like the *Daily News* and the *Daily Chronicle*, which are lecturing us all on the ethics of journalism, to say nothing of the *Nation*, were apparently afraid to publish that telegram when it was given in evidence before the Marconi Select Committee, so we reproduce it specially for their edification. It was read at a Marconi Banquet held in New York on March 16, 1912, being dated London, March 17, and ran as follows:

> Please congratulate Marconi and my brother on the successful development of a marvellous enterprise. I wish them all success in New York. I hope when you come back the coal strike will be finished.—RUFUS ISAACS.

In dismissing this wireless message in the House of Commons as "a very trumpery affair," the Attorney-General said: "I am reminded the telegram to which reference has been made was sent after March 7. The announcement had been made already in the public Press, and the shares had already been going up, so that it had nothing to do with that. It had all passed." As a matter of fact Marconi Ordinaries went up £1 in the week following the Attorney-General's telegram, while in the subsequent month they went up by £5 reaching the astounding figure of £9 10s. There

was likewise a desperate gamble in American Marconi shares, probably influenced by the success of the Company in "nobbling" the British Government on March 7, when "the Contract had been got" (*vide* Attorney-General), while such a telegram as that of Sir Rufus Isaacs was undoubtedly calculated to mislead an ignorant public as to the precise relations between the Government and the Company, and it is impossible to resist the conclusion that he would have been wiser in frankly telling the House of Commons "I made a stupid mistake in sending that telegram, for which I am sincerely sorry, and I feel sure the House will accept my statement that I had no conception whatsoever of the ulterior purposes to which it might have been put by market speculators."

Modesty is the last quality to be sought among Mandarins, and if sought it would rarely be found. Infallibility is claimed by every member of every Ministry, from the Prime Minister to the Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard, and the claim is conceded by whatever party the Infallible happens to belong to and by a considerable section of a faithful Press. It is, therefore, unusually difficult for Ministers—Cabinet or otherwise—to see things as they really are, or to know what kind of figure they cut in the public eye, but they should learn something before the close of the Marconi mystery.

As I have already pointed out, and it hardly needs repeating, the Select Committee—defunct at the moment of writing—was in difficulties because Mr. Asquith's colleagues failed to fulfil their specific pledge to Parliament, and though the pledge was only made by the Postmaster-General, the undertaking remains on record, and the longer its fulfilment is postponed the worse must become the plight of the Government because the more widespread the uneasiness of the public. The circumstances under which this pledge was given were sufficiently notable, although they have probably passed out of the public mind amid other preoccupations. Among many striking statements made during the debate of October 11 before Mr. Samuel made his "triumphant vindication," was that of Sir Frederick Banbury, an acknowledged authority on parliamentary propriety and a master of parliamentary procedure, as Ministers have more than once learnt to their cost. Sir Frederick Banbury, who, be it remembered, represents

the City of London, referred to the Marconi Agreement of March 7, and contrasted the candid manner in which the Company had treated its shareholders with the secretiveness of the Government towards the House of Commons; the Marconi Company had sent out a special circular (according to Sir Frederick Banbury) to inform their shareholders that they had "brought to a successful issue the negotiation which has proclaimed to the world the great strides made in the development of wireless telegraphy, and by this Company," while last July Mr. Marconi told a meeting of his Company, "I have yet to speak of perhaps the most important matter, namely, the Contract entered into with his Majesty's Government in respect of the Imperial wireless scheme." Perhaps Mr. Herbert Samuel may not be too high and mighty to notice that here again the sinister word "contract" is used. We would also call his attention to the fact, on the authority of Sir Frederick Banbury, that Mr. Marconi went on to say, "Considerable excitement resulted, and a good deal of speculation followed." On this the member for the City of London made the following observations:

I think no one will deny, on whatever side of the House he sits, that when the Government enters into a contract with an outside company or an outside individual it is absolutely incumbent upon the Government to inform Parliament at the earliest possible moment of what they have done; and if the Government find that the information is being exploited in order to encourage great speculation—and nobody can deny that great speculation did occur owing to the Agreement which was made between the Government and the Company—then I say it is the duty of the Government at once to come down to the House of Commons and state what has occurred, not only in their own interests, but in the interest of the public, because it is not right that the Government should allow the people of this country to be led into speculation upon statements which may or may not be right, and which are given to the public only by one party to that Agreement.*

And Sir Frederick Banbury added what has made a particularly bad impression abroad, that • •

Though the Marconi Company made this statement—that is to say, issued the

---

* The Postmaster-General was altogether too superior on August 1, 1912. Mr. J. Ward, M.P., asked him in the House of Commons: "Will the right hon. gentleman give the prices of the shares of the Marconi Company before the tender was accepted and the prices after it was known that the contract was sealed?"

Mr. Herbert Samuel: "I have no concern with the prices of the Company's shares either before the tender was accepted or immediately after or now."

circular to their shareholders—as long ago as the 7th of March, and though the Government was quite aware of the great speculation that was going on in the shares, it was I think, not until much later—two months, I think—when the right hon. gentleman, the Postmaster-General, was making his statement about the Post Office, that he alluded to it in a cursory way, and it was not until we were about adjourning (August 7) that any serious notice was taken or any serious statement made of the Agreement in the House.

Ministerial newspapers, which are evidently terrified at possible Marconi developments, would be far better employed in endeavouring to explain and defend, if they can, the clandestine conduct of the Postmaster-General than in blackguarding those who have devoted themselves to unveiling the great Marconi mystery.

Take another statement of another member in the same debate. I leave Mr. George Lansbury aside because, though he was admirable and fearless, he is no longer a member of the House of Commons, which might better have spared a better politician. Lord Robert Cecil, who is a high-minded, honourable man of rare and refreshing independence and courage, made an unusually strong speech—for the House of Commons—which diverted attention from the Agreement, which had been completely riddled by two Radical Members, Sir Henry Norman and Sir George Croydon Marks, to "the rumours" about Ministers. Lord Robert Cecil is a member of the Marconi Committee, and his observations are peculiarly apposite to-day. He is the last man to make himself responsible for the circulation of idle gossip or to be the mouthpiece of newspapers or periodicals. He had probably not read Mr. Lawson's articles which were printed on a back page of the *Outlook*, and I have grave doubts whether he is a reader of the *National Review*, from which politically Lord Robert is poles asunder, not only upon Tariff Reform but upon foreign policy, national defence, and woman's suffrage. In this particular speech (October 11) Lord Robert Cecil told the House of Commons:

So far as I am concerned, I never had the slightest belief in the rumours and stories that have been circulated concerning him (Sir Rufus Isaacs) or any other member of the Government.

But the speaker went on to say,

I have not heard those stories myself in principle or in detail from any member of this House, but they have reached me from public sources and *from a large number of people* (*my italics*). It is well to tell the truth plainly to this House. These stories

are extraordinarily prevalent all over the place. I say this—if I may very respectfully do so—as much in the interests of members of the Government as of anybody else; a mere denial by the Government before this House will not meet the case at all.

Observe—and the matter is important in view of the childish twaddle which has appeared in certain Coalition organs, among others, needless to say, the *Westminster Gazette*—Lord Robert Cecil did not give the House the sources of information which had made such an impression upon him. He did not say, "I met ———, who tells me, on the authority of a leading man of business, that a large sum was made by ——— (naming a particular Minister), who gambled in Marconi shares in somebody else's name and made so many thousand pounds, which were paid by a man of straw at the small branch of a leading bank into that Minister's private account at another big bank." Nor did he say, "I have heard of a broker in the North of England who was so fortunate as to be given the straight tip at the right moment by one of his Majesty's Ministers which enabled him to net sixty or seventy thousand pounds in New York of which in all probability a considerable proportion went into the pocket of his political patron." Lord Robert Cecil did not think it necessary to say that he had heard of connections of the Cabinet talking openly about successful Ministerial gambles on the Stock Exchange, or that friends of the Marconis had declared that it was very rough that the names of the Marconis should be alone mentioned in connection with the gamble, because several of the politicians were also "in it," though they had probably covered up their tracks. Lord Robert Cecil did not think it necessary to tell the House of Commons that he had been positively informed on what he regarded as reliable authority that a relation of a Minister in the City was believed to have carried through many profitable transactions in Marconi shares, via Dutch banks, on the strength of inside information. Nor did Lord Robert Cecil deem it necessary to inform the House of Commons that particular plutocrats on intimate terms with particular politicians were believed to have helped them over these delicate transactions. Nor did anybody expect that he should say anything of the kind. He contented himself, under the protection of Parliamentary privilege, with calling attention to the "extraordinarily prevalent" rumours on this subject. He declared that mere Parliamentary

denials, to which he evidently attaches as little value as we do, would not meet the present case.

There must be a full enquiry. I understand that that is the position taken up by the Government. *Members of the Government must take great care—I hope I am not putting it too didactically or too dogmatically—to submit themselves to examination* and cross-examination in the fullest possible way. We all have the interest in this not only of the members of the Government, but of the whole House of Commons, and the life of the nation is bound up with our respect for our public men and their personal integrity. That must be preserved, and unless it is, we are done for absolutely.

Nor was this all, for the speaker added:

I wish to point out what is the kind of source which, speculating as I do, I imagine has given rise to this kind of rumour. A contract has been entered into which has turned out to be highly beneficial, or is thought to be so, to the Marconi Company. It was entered into under the exceptional circumstances that there were no competitors allowed to tender against the Marconi Company. People, looking back, suggested that, because it happened that the Attorney-General was a relation of the Managing Director of the Marconi Company, therefore that Company had been given a very favourable contract. Then the Attorney-General, in the circumstances of the case, sent a very unfortunate telegram. I am not making the slightest reflection at all on the integrity of the right hon. and learned gentleman, but I feel that if he had had the whole circumstances before him he would have refrained from sending that telegram.

I feel the same, all the more because mud-slinging Ministerial rags dare not allow their readers to see the text of "the very unfortunate telegram" of our misguided and unrepentant Attorney-General. Lord Robert Cecil concluded by telling the House:

It would be folly for us to conceal from ourselves that there is, for some reason difficult to understand, a general recrudescence of talk of corruption in all sorts of directions. We hear first this story and then that story about some public man. That is a disastrous state of things. Here we have a set of charges. Let us take care that they are investigated and that the investigation is so full and complete that there is nothing like hushing up, that those accused will emerge from the enquiry not only without a stain upon their character, but under circumstances which will show that the charges are nothing but the malignant growth of a diseased imagination.

We should be very much obliged if the *Nation*, which, when not absolutely blinded by passion, is capable of recognising that political opponents may be quite as honest as itself, or our furious and foaming contemporary the *Manchester Guardian*, which vapours day by day about "Maxse and Mylius," would kindly distinguish between the attitude adopted by Lord Robert Cecil—who may be regarded as an impartial person because, according to the *Nation*, he voted in favour of "reporting" me to the Speaker,

and an hypothesis of sending me to prison which, after all, is a guarantee of his good faith—and the attitude of the *National Review* as set forth in the Editorial Notes from the time this question was first discussed in the month of September until to-day. However, that is a side and smaller issue of no particular importance.

What is important is that the moment after Lord Robert Cecil's damaging onslaught (October 11), Mr. Herbert Samuel as the mouthpiece of the Government, said:

"*This Committee which will be appointed will enquire into every aspect of this question, and Members of the Government will be most ready to appear before it. Every Member of the House may have full confidence that while every part of this transaction will come under the searchlight of examination, it will be shown that there is no uncleanliness in any quarter.*"

I have borrowed the word selected by Mr. Samuel, "uncleanliness," which explains the title of these articles, "A Fight for Clean Government." How far have Ministers helped the good cause? I have already quoted the Postmaster-General's omnibus declaration on behalf of himself and all his colleagues. Then there was the more limited statement of Sir Rufus Isaacs in the House of Commons on the same day:

> Never from the beginning, when the shares of the Marconi Company were fourteen shillings or nine pounds, have I had one single transaction with the shares of that Company. I am not only speaking for myself, but I am also speaking on behalf, I know, of both my right hon. friend the Postmaster-General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, in some way or other, in some of the articles, have been brought into this matter.

The Attorney-General's declaration was not very far-reaching, and it was unnecessary for him to speak for the Postmaster-General, who was present by his side, and, as we have seen, explicitly repudiated having gambled in Marconi shares, while his statement about the Chancellor of the Exchequer carried little or no weight, because when it came to Mr. Lloyd George's turn to intervene, instead of making the declaration which many people expected and everybody was entitled to, he lost his temper with his quondam friend Mr. George Lansbury, and made no denial at all as regards the rumours so busy with his name, an oversight which attracted attention because special stress

was laid on the denials of his colleagues. In its incoherent indignation, the *Nation* accuses me of making "a malicious suggestion that Mr. George had neglected to contradict the rumours." It is not a suggestion but a simple statement of fact, and if the Editor of the *Nation* will kindly indicate to me the passage in Mr. George's explosive intervention during the Marconi debate of October 11 in which he denied the rumours as regards himself, I will gladly contribute £10 towards any British object or institution which the *Nation* may select. Mr. George was violent and abusive, as always, and talked about "the sinister rumours that have been passed from one foul lip to another behind the backs of the House," but he made no such repudiation as that of Mr. Samuel or Sir Rufus Isaacs, though on one occasion, according to the Official Report, "Mr. Lloyd George made a remark which was inaudible." This, however, is not a topic on which Ministers can afford to be inaudible, and Mr. Lloyd George can be articulate whenever it suits him.

Naturally the public imagined that directly the promised Select Committee met Ministers would vie with one another to fulfil the undertaking of the Postmaster-General, and throng the Committee Room fortified by their pass-books, bank managers and brokers, or any other persons who might be useful for their purpose, all of whom, speaking on oath, would once and for all have set at rest the rumours which Lord Robert Cecil, to say nothing of Mr. Lansbury, called attention to in the House of Commons as a matter worthy of public and Parliamentary cognisance. Great has been the general surprise at the course actually followed, and at the prolonged delay in the appearance of the Ministers who conceived their honour to be impugned by these "extraordinarily prevalent" rumours. While making every allowance for the difficulties besetting a Select Committee of private members in matters affecting the great men of the Front Bench, one cannot help feeling that an enormous and needless amount of time has been wasted. Doubtless the Committee has aimed at efficiency and despatch, but few would consider that they have attained their aim.

The protracted silence of Ministers on matters of moment which they declare closely affect their honour has, to put it mildly, been one of the most unfortunate episodes of latter-day politics.

In several respects, however, the Committee has not laboured in vain, as will be seen when the public digest the Minutes of Evidence published day by day, which reveal a state of things inside the Post Office suggesting the urgency of a general enquiry into our present administrative system. This topic must be postponed for the moment, but having had the advantage of reading the Official evidence in full and taking only the Official evidence, I can assure the readers of this Review that the attitude of the Post Office towards the Marconi Company is not the least mysterious of the many mysterious incidents in this most mysterious affair. It was evidently a case of official obsession, and when a department succumbs to an obsession there is no form of injustice, ineptitude, maladministration, prevarication, to use the mildest language in our vocabulary, to which it will not descend. Sir Alexander King's evidence before the Marconi Committee should be read by the chiefs of every other department in the State as a striking example of "how not to do it." It should also whet the public appetite to know what is going on elsewhere.

Meanwhile I am not unhopeful that, disastrous as has been the delay on the part of his Majesty's Ministers to testify on oath and submit themselves to cross-examination, they will, without further ado, invite the newly constituted Committee, if the latter is too shy to invite them, to enable them to come forward and prove to the world that "Rumour is a lying jade" and that Cabinet Ministers are still entitled to enjoy the reputation of Cæsar's wife.

L. J. Maxse.

THE NATIONAL SERVICE LEAGUE*

GENTLEMEN,

It is a real pleasure to find myself speaking to an audience mainly composed of Bristol men and women. For my earliest recollections are connected with Bristol. I was only two years old when, with my parents, I first sailed up the Avon, after nearly six months' voyage from Calcutta, in the good ship *St. George*, a vessel of some 600 tons, which then plied with passengers and goods between Bristol and the East Indies. My father, whose career as a soldier I naturally followed, had been close upon thirty years in India before he returned to this country in 1834; and he had only been in England for two years when he started back to India in that same good ship *St. George*. I can just remember being taken on board the vessel to see him off. My first schools were at Long Ashton and Clifton. Later in my life, on coming home from India on leave, I found my father and mother still at Clifton. And later still, when I came back after the second Afghan War, it was by the people of Bristol I was most warmly welcomed. I was made a freeman of this great city, I was entertained by and made an honorary member of the Merchant Venturers' Company, and I was presented with a beautiful gift of plate by my father's and mother's many Bristol and Clifton friends.

With these happy reminiscences of Bristol still fresh in my memory, you will, I am sure, understand me when I say that I do not come amongst you as a stranger, but as a friend—a very old friend—one who knew Bristol before almost any person in this room was born, one who is very proud of being a citizen of this historic city, and is deeply interested in its progress and prosperity.

* A Speech delivered at Bristol, February 14, 1913.

Now, gentlemen, on such an occasion as this, and at a time when many of you have still in your hands a small book for which I am responsible; a book in which I have set forth at some length the different aspects of the case for National Service—at such a time, I say, you will not expect me to enter into any elaborate exposition or restatement of the case. On the other hand, speaking to-night as a freeman of the city to other citizens, it may interest you to hear from me, as President of the League, what I consider to be the first principles—the bedrock of our whole position.

To-night I shall have the greatest pleasure in making this statement, because both on this platform and amongst the audience I observe representatives of that great party, the Liberal Party, which in its Press, at least, has from time to time subjected the proposals of the League to sharp criticism; but a criticism which, I am bound to say, has been based on misunderstanding of the political and social bearings of the League's proposals. I therefore welcome the presence of Liberals amongst us to-night, for this is a question above the interests of party.

What, then, is the object of the National Service League? That object is, first and foremost, to ensure the safety of these islands and the maintenance of this great Empire.

For a hundred years our supremacy at sea has been undisputed, and our army sufficient to undertake all the duties required of it; although sometimes at enormous and unnecessary cost, owing to our carelessness as to military arrangements. Unfortunately, there is now no justification for this immunity from anxiety. Other nations are building powerful fleets, and, year by year, are increasing their armies. If, therefore, we intend to hold our own as a great Power, how are we to succeed unless by emulating that display of national spirit, and by demanding at any sacrifice an increase in our army and navy proportionate to the increase in theirs?

• •

My friends, I have no desire to stir up an aggressive or jingo spirit in the nation. That is the last thing I wish. Peace, not war, is my aim and earnest desire; defence, not offence; preservation, not aggression. But you must bear in mind the parable: "When a strong man keepeth his palace his goods are in peace: but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein

be trusted, and divideth his spoils." Therefore, what I do wish to stir up, to foster and develop, is a more manly and patriotic spirit in the nation—a spirit which shall induce our youth to realise that they must be not only ready, but prepared to guard the heritage handed down to them. I wish above all to implant this spirit of self-sacrifice and energetic patriotism in the young men of this country—first and immediately in those young men to whom happy circumstances have rendered the earning of a livelihood unnecessary; but ultimately in every young man of British blood, rich or poor; for you, as I have said in the book to which I have just referred, you young men *are* really England, you *are* Britain; and yours will be the glory of this victory; yours the suffering and the shame of defeat.

Let me now consider very briefly, first, what are the political bearings of the League's proposals; secondly, what are their social bearings.

And here I must make an earnest appeal to Liberals of every shade of opinion, both to you who are here in this hall and to Liberals throughout the kingdom: for this, I repeat, is a question above the interests of party; it is a question which concerns the honour and, so to speak, the very existence of this nation and this Empire. What Britisher, I ask, is there in any corner of these islands to whom that honour and that safety are not of paramount value? Where we differ, I submit, is not in essentials; it is in the conception of the means by which those essential ends are to be realised.

How, then, are the aims of the National Service League related to the principles of Liberalism?

I answer that the National Service League proposes to substitute for a system which is full of inequalities, which is unfair, inefficient, and inadequate, and which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be said to be based on Liberal principles—to substitute, I say, a system which is truly democratic, a system in which every citizen of these islands, high and low, rich and poor, shall have equal rights and equal responsibilities.

Our existing system, on the other hand, is neither truly Liberal nor truly democratic. For what can be less democratic, or less in keeping with the historic principles of Liberalism, than to allow the burden of our present makeshift system of

Home Defence to fall upon a few patriotic employers and employees? Besides, even if we agree to take advantage of their patriotism, that patriotism by our illiberal inaction loses half its value; for those men, each in his sphere, may be willing to make great sacrifices, but they simply cannot afford the time for that lengthy and continuous training necessary to ensure such a discipline as will stand the severe test of modern war.

In politics, then, the National Service scheme is democratic. What will be its social effects? We propose that those young men, without profession or calling of any kind, who frequent our clubs—and who, though they are made of good stuff, from self-indulgence and the lack of discipline, drift into becoming wasters—shall stand in the ranks shoulder to shoulder with youths in other strata of society, who—equally without discipline—become loafers, and in many instances hooligans.

No one who has observed the effects on character and physique of adequate and real military training can doubt that this addition to their education would make both for the social betterment of the nation and the happiness of the young men themselves. Their courage as well as their self-respect is fostered; their self-control developed, whilst for all the emergencies of life their resourcefulness, promptitude, and endurance are heightened and increased. In a word, whatever their trade or profession they do their work better, for by such discipline they are made in every way better men.

There is a great deal of what I can only describe as ignorant cant talked—unwittingly, perhaps—by some of our opponents, irrespective of party, on the "brutalising" effect of military training. The terms "brutal and licentious" soldier—if it was ever other than a libel on our English, Scotch, and Irish soldiers—has long since ceased to have any meaning.

The conduct and bearing of our soldiers, it is no exaggeration to say, are the admiration of the civilised world. No matter where they are, nor what trials or temptations confront them, they never fall below the standard of conduct worthy of this country. It was my privilege, when I gave up the command of the army in South Africa, to tell the world that our soldiers had behaved as heroes in the field and as gentlemen in quarters.

There is another misconception—or in some cases, I am afraid,

I must almost say false accusation—which is used as an argument against universal military training. It is embodied in the word "militarism." This word, when used by our opponents, is meant, I suppose, to imply a bloodthirsty, swashbuckling tendency likely to result in enterprises to gratify the ambitions of a military caste. But, instead of encouraging such a spirit, universal military training would do exactly the reverse. If every man were trained by law to defend his country, as in Switzerland—the most democratic nation in Europe—those in authority would take care that their foreign policy should not be provocative. Does any one suggest that the adoption of universal military training in Australia, New Zealand, or South Africa is making these Dominions bellicose and aggressive ?

There are two other points I wish particularly to impress upon you. First, that the National Service League repudiates the idea that a force based on compulsory service would ever be used to put down strikes. It is because of this supposed danger that Mr. Blatchford, who was formerly a staunch supporter of National Service, has lately averred that he prefers to run the risk of invasion; but the idea is an utterly mistaken one. The National Service League has never for a moment contemplated such a force being used against men striking for what they consider their rights. If a Labour Government in Australia has had no fear that their citizen army will be used for this purpose, I do not see why the wage-earners in this country should entertain such a fear. The second point is the much-discussed officer question. In regard to this question, the proposal of the National Service League is that all youths, no matter what their station in life may be, should start on equal terms. That is to say, every one would have to commence his training as an ordinary private in the ranks. Promotion to the rank of officer would be because of merit and suitability, and not because of social status; and as in the Dominion's citizen armies, the expenses of messing, &c., would be reduced to a minimum, so as to give the less well-to-do every possible facility.

These, my friends, are the broad outlines of the proposals of the National Service League. Exact details will, of course, have to be worked out when the scheme comes before Parliament. In the meantime what I wish to impress upon you with all the

emphasis at my command is, that this training of the youth of the nation will render all thought of the invasion of this country out of the question. It will make the civil population feel that the army is part and parcel of themselves, and it will free the navy to perform its legitimate duties in dealing with hostile fleets and protecting our food and trade routes. This in itself is justification many times over for the sacrifice we are calling upon the nation to make. But when in addition you consider the advantages to the individual citizen which I have described; and, further, when you consider that by causing all classes to work shoulder to shoulder for the common good, it will create a better understanding and nobler feelings between those classes, you cannot fail, I trust, to rally round the standard that the National Service League has raised; and help us with all your power to bring those blessings to the homes of your countrymen.

ROBERTS.

WHY FRANCE LOST IN 1870

THE CONTRAST WITH TO-DAY

THE continuous succession of French works of the highest merit dealing with the war of 1870 is a remarkable phenomenon. In the last few years we have had the great history of the war, still in course of publication, by the French Staff, which is a monument of impartiality, completeness and lucidity. We have had M. Ollivier's history of the Second Empire, of which the sixteenth volume has just appeared—a book of eminent good faith and extraordinary interest. We have had M. Bapst's *Life of Canrobert*, which like M. Ollivier's *magnum opus*, is still incomplete. We have had an admirable series of monographs on various battles of the war by Captain Picard and General Bonnal. These are but a few names out of a great host of books ceaselessly pouring from the presses of Paris. When we remember the extraordinary attraction which the epic of the First Empire must exercise on French minds, since its campaigns show France at the very zenith of her glory, this concentration of attention upon a period filled only with disaster and humiliation—a period upon which no Frenchman even to-day can look back without a shudder—is surely proof of a fortitude and moral courage that augur well for the future of France. It is from defeat and disaster that nations learn to mend their ways. Jena taught Prussia the methods which led straight up to Waterloo and Sedan. The French nation of to-day is quietly, humbly, following in its conqueror's path, interrogating the past to ascertain why it was beaten in "the terrible year" and how it can win if the assault should be renewed.

So great is the prestige which the Germans have acquired by their victories in 1870 that it is as well for the world to have the

actual nature of their achievements investigated in cold blood, and the conditions of 1870 dispassionately compared with those of to-day. As Captain Picard has finely said, "Bitter as is the task of relating the events which led the Frency army to Sedan and left it with no alternative but capitulation, it is not paradoxical to assert that a profound study of our defeats leaves, not so much a sense of infinite sorrow for our misfortunes in this past, as a feeling of consolation for the present and of hope for the future. We have only to reflect on the difference between our army in 1870 and our army of to-day. The very astonishment which fills us at the record of our past mistakes gives us the measure of the advance we have achieved in forty years." "In 1870," writes M. Ollivier in his last volume, "we were overwhelmed by an unbroken series of aberrations, of failures physical, intellectual and moral, which it would be impossible for human nature to repeat in the same degree."

In these statements there is nothing exaggerated. They contain the truth. For what were the causes that led to the French defeat in 1870, and how far have they vanished? First is the fact that France was surprised in every sense of the word. She was surprised by Bismarck, who forced the struggle upon her at a critical moment, before Niel's scheme of army reform had had time to work, before her artillery had been re-armed, and before she had been able to secure the alliance of Austria and Italy, with whom Napoleon was in negotiation. Bismarck did not make war till he had obtained a positive assurance from Moltke and Roon that Germany was sure of victory. Then he chose the very moment when the French Premier, M. Ollivier, was declaring "there is no German question"—a declaration in which he honestly believed—to spring the Hohenzollern candidature for the throne of Spain upon France. Only fourteen days before war broke out the French army was reduced by 10,000 men. How Bismarck compelled France to fight is now familiar to all. "Blessed is the hand that falsified the Ems despatch," a German historian has written, and Bismarck himself exulted in that falsification. But to-day such a stratagem would not succeed. Even if Germany had a Bismarck to attempt its repetition, France is not likely to be rushed into war in the same way because her diplomacy is in wiser hands than the Duc de Gramont's.

Believing that the French Government was delivering an aggressive attack upon Prussia out of sheer jealousy and hatred, Europe in 1870 was generally hostile to France. To-day it is Germany, not France, that is widely distrusted, and France has the definite alliance of Russia, and a promise of British support if attacked. No such damaging documents as the draft treaty handing Belgium over to France—a treaty which Bismarck had obtained by an astute trick but which Napoleon had never accepted—could be produced by the German diplomatists. Europe has entire confidence in the good faith and straightforwardness of the diplomacy of the Third Republic.

Secondly, the German forces placed in the field at the outset were overwhelmingly superior in numbers to the French. On July 31, 1870, the French returns show that only 238,000 men were available at the front for the campaign. The German effective field army at this date, deducting all detachments and second line troops, was 450,000, a superiority of nearly 100 per cent. At the present day the total German force which can be mobilised is 5,500,000 according to figures given by General von Falckenhausen. The French total was placed by M. Klotz in 1911 at 4,000,000. The German field army is organised in twenty-five army corps, of which it is understood that at least three will be required for defence on the Russian frontier, leaving twenty-two for action against France. The French field army consists of twenty-one corps, one of which is absent in Algeria, and two of which will be required to watch the Italian frontier. This leaves eighteen army corps available for the Alsace-Lorraine frontier. Even if we suppose that the entire German twenty-five corps are thrown upon these eighteen French corps, odds of twenty-five to eighteen are very different from odds of two to one.

In 1870 the French artillery numbered 780 field guns and 144 mitrailleuses, which were only distributed at the last moment to the troops and the proper use of which was unknown to the French Generals. The guns were of an antiquated pattern, muzzle-loaders, and their replacement had already been decided by Napoleon. Their value was further reduced by an insane mistake of Marshal Leboeuf's. Originally, they were equipped with shells, with time-fuses arranged to explode at distances of 1500, 1750, 2000, 2300, 2700, and 3000 metres. Leboeuf sup-

pressed the distances of 1750, 2000, 2300 and 2700 metres, so that the French guns were powerless at ranges between 1500 and 3000 metres (a metre is approximately 1·1 yards). The German artillery had only to take up positions at 2000 or 2700 yards and the French guns could not fire with effect. This fact was sufficient in itself to give the German artillery an overwhelming advantage. We may almost say that the French army took the field without artillery—the most essential of the three arms in offensive battles. As Captain Colin has pointed out,* it was because of this fearful weakness that the French troops were crushed beneath the weight of the German shells whenever they attempted to attack. But this was not all. To the 780 French cannon and the 144 useless† mitrailleuses, the Germans could oppose 1558 guns, so that in numbers again they were superior to the extent of about 100 per cent. There is no such superiority either in number of quality of guns to-day. The German artillery is to the French in numbers about as five to four. But the French gun is admittedly the best gun in use in Europe to-day. It is really a quick-firer; that is to say it has no recoil and can be fired time after time when the range has been obtained, without being relaid. The German gun—like the British—jumps slightly with the recoil after each shot, and has to be constantly relaid.

In any battle of the future between the two armies the German artillery would not be free, as it was in 1870, to beat down the infantry fire of its enemy. It would be hard put to it to hold its own, and the silencing of so good and perfectly efficient an artillery as the French would be impossible without immense sacrifices.

As if further to handicap the unhappy French, their artillery in 1870 adopted fundamentally unsound tactics. Where the Germans pushed all their available guns into the line of battle, the French artillery commanders kept a large number of their guns in reserve, so that their batteries were destroyed or driven out of action in detail. Thus, these were the conditions: The French guns were useless at medium ranges; they were originally outnumbered in a ratio of two to one by the German guns; and this inferiority was increased by the practice of only bringing about half the guns into action at the opening of the battle.

* *Transformations de la Guerre*, p. 34.

† Because their use had not been studied.

As against this extraordinary inferiority in artillery, the French in 1870 possessed a rifle greatly superior in range and accuracy to the German weapon. There is no such difference to-day; indeed the German rifle is very slightly superior. But in 1870 the French generals did not know how to use their excellent rifle.

And this brings us to a point of extreme importance—the quality of the French leadership in 1870. Captain Colin has shown that there is no real foundation for the common idea that the French regulations at the time of the war of 1870 discouraged the offensive. Both the official and unofficial teaching emphasised the importance of the attack, and in this respect there was nothing to choose between the French and German armies. But whereas the German generals acted on this teaching, the French did not. The explanation is to be found in part in the deplorable weakness of the French artillery, but also in the defective training of the French generals. In France the theory of war and the campaigns of Napoleon I. were not studied at all or carelessly studied. In Germany they were the subject of constant examination and reflection. In France, experience in the petty campaigns of Algeria had led officers and men and statesmen to imagine that French troops could always "muddle through," even without knowledge and a doctrine of war. Some of the French high officers had obtained valuable experience of serious war in Italy and the Crimea. But the men with this experience were growing old by 1870, and had lost their fire and energy. The German generals, on the other hand, had gained recent and precious knowledge in the war with Austria only four years before the struggle with France.

Above all, the commander-in-chief of the French army was physically and mentally unfit for his task. The Emperor Napoleon was suffering from an agonising disease which inflicted tortures upon him whenever he mounted a horse. At the combat of Saarbrueck, with which the war opened, he was in such a state that he was compelled to lean against a tree to stand. Not only this, but he caught a violent cold at the opening of the campaign and this affected the working of his brain. "How unfortunate! Terrible! But what are we to do?" he repeated constantly. Marshal Leboeuf, his War Minister and Chief of the

Staff, told discreet emissaries from Paris whom he could trust—for he was absolutely loyal to the Emperor—"It is the Emperor that is ruining everything." When Napoleon's despatches were being read to him one most critical night by a captain on the staff, "at the second or third, the Emperor stopped him. 'I suffer too much . . . I cannot listen to anything more . . . Leave me.'" His illness had shaken his will and left him a man who was dying by inches and who was quite incapable of any strong resolution. Moreover, he was by nature a weak man. Gentle, kindly, good-natured, notwithstanding the *coup d'état*, such was his character that he could not give a firm order and insist upon its being obeyed. There was no one about him to help him or to take the command from his shoulders. Leboeuf, as a former aide-de-camp, did not assert himself strongly, but usually deferred to the Sovereign's opinion, though he was brave and loyal enough to give sound advice.

I was obliged to admit [said one of Napoleon's suite] that when we received these appalling telegrams (telling of the defeats at Woerth and Forbach) I did not find among the generals in whose atmosphere the Emperor lived, the calm, the judgment, the cheerfulness and firmness which I should have liked to distinguish among these old soldiers who all had waged war and who were the natural counsellors of their Sovereign.

The result was that while Napoleon was altogether unfit to command no one else could exercise authority in his presence. Realising his own weakness the Emperor always listened to the last adviser, and changed his opinion from moment to moment. Counter-order succeeded order; the troops marched and counter-marched. The following series of telegrams, sent from Metz to Nancy on a single day, illustrates the hopeless indecision that prevailed:

Keep all the supplies at Nancy that you have there.

Send to Metz all the supplies you have.

Send nothing to Metz.

Consider the last telegram as null; send to Metz all you have.

The effect of these shifts and hesitations was felt by the soldiers, and demoralised the army before it came into contact with the enemy. Just as a horse knows when it has a nervous, uncertain rider, so an army knows instinctively when it is weakly led. The German high command in the hands of the old King William and Moltke represented energy and will personified. It knew what was to be done and did it.

All who saw Napoleon at Metz felt that it was vital to remove him from the army and to induce him to return to Paris, where his presence would have been of great service to the country. But, unfortunately, the Empress would not hear of this course and exerted all her power to prevent the withdrawal of her husband from the army. M. Ollivier tells us that she declared it was "impossible" for him to return without a victory. Her resistance to the proposal "was not inspired by dynastic interests and still less by national interests. Hers was the devotion of a wife who had resigned herself to her husband's loss of his throne, but not to his loss of his good name. This was an entirely honourable sentiment in a private person, but it had nothing royal about it. A ruler on such an occasion at this ought to sacrifice his renown and his personal glory to the safety of his people." In the end the situation became impossible. Another commander-in-chief was appointed, but not until the mischief had been done; and to the last Napoleon's presence brought disaster on his gallant troops, though the sentiment which led him to share their dangers and trials was, as M. Ollivier has said, an entirely honourable and even noble one.

Such a complication as an invalid commander-in-chief will certainly not recur in the French army. The modern French generals are equal in courage to their predecessors of 1870, but they are infinitely superior in strength of character and knowledge. For the last forty years the history of war has been closely studied in the French army. Its military literature is to-day second to none.

Of the French generals in 1870, two were generally regarded, even by their own contemporaries who did not look for a high degree of efficiency, as ill-fitted for command in the field. De Failly had been one of Napoleon's aides-de-camp. He was placed in command of the 5th corps and distinguished himself by utter incompetence and scandalous disobedience. Frossard, in command of the 2nd corps, was the Prince Imperial's tutor. He was a fair theorist and a passable writer on war; a man of high intellectual attainment; but, being an engineer, he had little practice in the handling of troops in the field and was disliked by his men. His failure was complete.

In 1870, the French fortresses were ill-prepared and badly

armed, and as the French army was speedily forced to adopt the defensive, this was a serious matter. To-day the whole French eastern frontier is protected by a series of works and fortresses, all excellently prepared for war. Along the 180 miles of frontier runs a chain of forts, in which there are only two gaps—one near the Belgian frontier, to the north of Verdun, now it is believed, being closed; and a second between Toul and Epinal, left with intention, because this is the point at which the French staff would prefer to fight a pitched battle. The object in constructing this chain of forts was to give France an artificially strong frontier, since she had been deprived of her natural frontier by the loss of Alsace-Lorraine. It has to a great extent been attained. Until the assaults on Port Arthur, it was generally believed in Germany that forts of this type could be rushed by a determined attack carried out regardless of any loss of life. Since the fearful and resultless slaughter at Port Arthur, German opinion on this point has been greatly shaken. It is now considered possible that the forts would prove impregnable to ordinary attack by field troops, and that they would have to be reduced by siege operations. This is a matter of extreme moment, as the German plan of campaign against France and Russia is believed to consist in flinging almost every available German soldier upon France, destroying her army, and then moving the German troops back through Germany to the eastern frontier. Such a plan involves as its essential for success that the French army shall be very quickly dealt a smashing blow. It precludes siege operations. Whether without the forts it would be possible for the German armies, even with such a superiority as they at present possess, to destroy the French armies with the requisite speed is very doubtful. It is as certain as any fact can be that it is impossible, given the present force and quality of the French army and the existence of the forts.

In 1870, the French mobilisation was so defective that the calculated strength of 420,000 men with the colours was never attained. The German mobilisation on the other hand was carried out with speed and success, and every man wanted was there. It was through this perfectly prepared mobilisation that the Germans were able to strike their enemy with such a marked numerical advantage three weeks after the outbreak of war.

To-day, the French mobilisation will probably, according to General Bernhardi, be completed a few hours before the German. In the *alerte* of 1905, without fuss and with few people in Europe learning what was happening, the French military authorities brought up eight army corps to the neighbourhood of the frontier, though, as is well known, at the time of the Delcassé crisis, the French army was badly prepared in comparison with its state of readiness to-day. Thus here again Germany has no advantage.

In the new arm, the air service, the two Powers are on an even footing. France has an immense superiority in aeroplanes, and her airmen are among the best in the world. Germany has a marked superiority in airships which may render very precious services, and as yet the French authorities have not seriously grappled with this matter, though it is hoped that in the present year steps will be taken to strengthen the French fleet of dirigibles and to provide the airship garages which are essential. The German aircraft are notably superior to the French in size, speed, and carrying power, and this though France led the world by designing the first dirigible balloon.

Even with all the material and moral factors against them, the French came very near victory in the earlier battles of the war.* At Woerth, for instance, if de Failly had marched with the 5th corps to MacMahon's aid and had obeyed the orders given him, it is certain that the Germans must have suffered a repulse, if not a serious defeat. This is the conclusion of a distinguished German military writer, Major Kunz.

> The Germans [he says] were obliged to employ all their forces to crush the 45,000 (really 40,000) combatants under Marshal MacMahon's orders At the close of the fight their energy was exhausted. The only exceptions were some fractions of units which had only just reached the field. It cannot then be doubted that the battle would have resulted in a terrible defeat for the Germans if the Marshal (MacMahon) had suddenly been joined, about 2 P.M., by 28,000 fresh French troops at Elsasshausen.

Captain Picard, who quotes this criticism, holds that it goes too far. The German artillery would have beaten back a French offensive. But, if the battle had been indecisive, at the very outset of the campaign the Germans would have suffered a check, and Austria and Italy might have decided to intervene.

* A wounded German officer told Hoenig during the German advance at Mars-la-Tour: "You will be astonished. It is no cat shooting as in 1866" (the year of the war with Austria).

At the battle of Forbach, fought on the same day, between approximately equal forces, the French commander, Frossard, held his own and reinforcements were fast coming up. But at the critical moment he lost heart and ordered a retreat. Here again there was a lamentable failure of other French generals in his immediate vicinity to give him support. M. Ollivier defends the conduct of Bazaine, who was chiefly responsible for this failure, yet the facts speak for themselves. Had Bazaine moved up with every man the moment he knew that a battle was raging, Forbach must have been a great French victory. The war of 1870, instead of opening with two grave French defeats, would then have begun with an indecisive battle in Alsace and a French success in Lorraine, and this notwithstanding all the defects of the French supreme command and the numerical weakness of the French army.

At the battle of Mars-la-Tour, really the decisive struggle of the whole war, the French troops won a victory in spite of their generals, and the generals threw it away. The battle was fought in these circumstances: The French army in full strength, with about 150,000 men, was retreating from Metz along the road to Verdun. The main German forces were at some distance from the line of retreat, as they had to move round Metz southwards. Only one German army corps and one division of German cavalry were near the road along which the French were marching. The German strength at the opening of the battle did not exceed 30,000 men, though it steadily rose. The German object was to delay the French retreat, and, if possible, to get possession of the Verdun road, thus cutting off the French from Paris. By a curious stroke of luck—which throughout this campaign ran against the French—the German army corps on the scene happened to be the best and most solid in the German army, and the general in command of it, Alvensleben II., an officer of the most exceptional courage, insight and energy. In fact it might be truly said that only one German corps, the 3rd, was capable of stopping the French in such circumstances, and only one German general would have had the audacity to attempt such a blow. The right corps and the right general were on the spot, but this was not due to the German headquarters; it was the result, first of chance, which so ordered events that the 3rd corps was closest to the line

of retreat, and second of Alvensleben's own splendid initiative in disobeying his instructions. For this initiative, of course, Moltke and the German military system must be given full credit, since German officers had been systematically encouraged to think for themselves. But the initiative could never have been displayed had not fortune brought Alvensleben and his men to the very spot where they were most needed. Moltke, whose judgment was usually so sure, had on this occasion mistaken the situation. He thought that the French had carried their retreat so far that the Germans could do nothing but pursue.

The odds were so overwhelmingly against the Germans that, if even an ordinary second-rate general had commanded the French, their victory was certain. No genius was required. But, unhappily for the French, the man in command was Bazaine, who had not one single idea in his head, and whose only aim was to shirk responsibility by issuing no orders. A magnificent opportunity of crushing the German 3rd corps and the 10th corps, which in the afternoon came to its assistance, was thrown away. The subordinate French commanders were too old and too dispirited to display initiative themselves. Yet, as Colonel Picard states, had Bazaine ordered them to advance and attack the enemy on that August afternoon, he would have driven the two German corps back in disorder and he could then, with troops exalted by victory, have assailed Prince Frederick Charles's army at a moment when it was dangerously scattered. It was the last chance, and when it passed, Alsace and Lorraine were lost.

It is because she recognises this tremendous renascence of the French army that Germany has decided upon a great increase in her land forces. France has done all that lies in her power. With a population of only forty millions she cannot by any device create and maintain as large an army as Germany, with her sixty-six millions. Everything now depends upon England's action. She alone by adopting universal service, could restore the balance of power which is once more in danger. Russia can help, if time is given. But the new and immense armaments which Germany is now preparing render it possible that France may be struck down before the Russian masses which are remote from the German frontier, can come into play. German soldiers calculate that, if with twenty-five corps they cannot crush France with the

required rapidity, they would be able to effect their end with thirty corps, and it is at some such standard that they are now aiming. With such a force they hope to compel France to abandon the British Alliance and thus to isolate the British Empire, whose fall would open to them the world. Are we going to remain apathetic and inert while our destiny is thus being decided? Nothing is more certain than that, France once beaten down or forced into a German alliance, Britain could not stand against an immense coalition alone.

H. W. WILSON.

RUSSIA AND THE EUROPEAN SITUATION

Is it peace? Is it war? . . . The acutest minds in Europe are busy over the answer, and already the trouble, in countless hidden ways, is affecting the daily lives of hundreds of millions of people. A few months ago the peace of Europe was thought to be fully secured by the novel device of modern diplomacy, which may be put in familiar language as "being neighbourly to next door, but friends with next door but one." In the chain of alliances, ententes, and understandings set up on this new principle, any State that might be tempted to quarrel with or take advantage of a neighbour found public opinion on either side united to do the duty of a policeman at each elbow. Petty nuisances, of the order known in diplomacy as "pin-pricks," were easily suppressed by the new device. But unfortunately it was believed by the Germanic Powers to be primarily intended to serve the purpose of a ring fence round their cherished ambitions. They have spent the last few years in earnest and repeated efforts to break through. Austria-Hungary all but effected a breach by her annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, but the friends rallied again. The attempts of Germany, particularly in Morocco, almost as nearly approached success. Russia, meanwhile, had been recovering strength and confidence with a rapidity and to a degree that are still imperfectly realised, owing to the prevalence of an erroneous belief that the Japanese War and internal troubles had crippled her for a generation to come. Other considerations apart, it should be remembered that States whose structure is fundamentally simple are not easily shattered by any blow, or succession of blows, and their recovery is sure and speedy.

Europe was in the same period drifting into a division into two armed camps, the Triple Entente—in effect a league of peace—on the one side and the Triple Alliance on the

other. On more than one occasion a rupture seemed evident and war inevitable. This threatening chasm was delicately bridged by Russia. While remaining, as a Russian Minister expressed it to the writer, "arch-loyal to her friends," Russia in 1911 at Potsdam came to a cautious and strictly limited agreement with Germany. A year later, during the visit of the Kaiser to Reval, the Russian Foreign Minister, M. Sazonov, re-established the Concert of Europe by securing Germany's assent to the status quo proposals in reference to the Balkans, where trouble was foreseen as early as the spring of 1912. A détente of the strained relations between Russia and Austria followed and enabled these two Powers, as the "most nearly interested," to warn the Balkan States that Europe would not consent to their securing any territorial aggrandisement by a war with Turkey. At the same time the status quo proposals ensured that matters should be no worse for the Balkan States if they were attacked and defeated by Turkey. But the primary object aimed at was to preserve peace. In this diplomacy failed as it must always fail when either national passions (as in the present case) or cold-blooded calculation (as in the "blood and iron" policies) have predetermined the arbitrament of the sword.

During the progress of the brief war which revealed to the world the futility of toy-parliaments as props for the old age of Oriental despotisms, Russian diplomacy was busily engaged in the task of endeavouring to elucidate the views of various European States on the status quo. More than a generation had slipped by since the Berlin Congress created this status quo, a multiple-sided and highly complex structure. The points of view were many, and the lights had shifted much in the lapse of a generation. Long before diplomacy had made much progress towards the elucidation of contemporary hopes and fears Turkey was defeated in the field, and an entirely novel situation arose on the ruins of the status quo.

At the Berlin Congress (1878) England and Russia had met from opposite sides, "foot to foot and eye to eye." Many years later one of the greatest of those responsible for the acts of that Congress confessed that we "had backed the wrong horse," in supporting Turkey against Russia. England's reasons for this

were largely negative, but other Powers, notably the new-fledged German Empire and the recently defeated Holy Roman Empire of the Hapsburgs, supported Turkey for reasons positive and real. In the result the Balkan Peninsula was so divided, and the administration of the divisions so arranged, as to furnish the Germanic Powers with a fairly clear pathway to the Orient. The Drang nach Osten has since brought the German drummer to the markets of Persia and a German railway nearly to the Persian Gulf! Russia retired from that epoch-making Congress with rage and bitterness at heart, robbed of all the fruits of a hard-won war, and hating England and all her ways with the soul-satisfying hatred of undeserved humiliation. She found her compensation—and an effective means of checking British opposition to her policy—in the creation of a new empire in Central Asia, the as yet unrecognised El Dorado of the Twentieth Century. Determined in her exasperation to secure at least something—the Emperor Alexander II is believed to have made a personal matter of it—Russia insisted, most unfortunately, on recovering possession of part of Bessarabia ceded to Rumania at the Treaty of Paris in 1856. By this unwise demand, which the Congress sanctioned, Russia threw into the arms of Austria for over thirty years a friend and ally who had fought by her side against Turkey, and whose sovereign, King Charles, still happily reigning, had commanded a Russian corps d'armée before Plevna.

In 1878, then, the Balkan Peninsula was divided horizontally east and west to form a barrier against the ambitions of Russia, who was at all costs to be kept out of Constantinople lest she should menace the security of the British route to India. For over thirty years the Great Powers maintained intact the essential feature of this Berlin status quo, with repeated changes of detail, but always enabling Turkey to go calmly on her way, buoyed up securely, like an imposing soap-bubble, on the conflicting currents of international jealousies. For over thirty years the Great Christian Powers trifled with the lives and fortunes of fellow Christians in Macedonia. The age of chivalry is long gone by and no Power cared to take the crusader's part for the release of the suffering Christians under the heavy yoke of the Moslem. Russia, the one Great Power which a dozen years ago might still have been moved to action by the fanatic cry of the crusader,

had had too terrible a lesson at the Berlin Congress. In the west that idealism, that capacity for enthusiasm, which made the crusades, freed Greece a century ago, liberated the slaves under the British flag—to name a few of the great ideals that have crystallised into policy—had given place to a utilitarian spirit incapable of striking out one great thought, of producing one great man to direct the gaze and inspire the hearts of a purblind, careless world. When British statesmen did turn a glance in the direction of the Balkan Christians it was but for narrow purposes connected with victory at the polls of little England. This immediate petty object secured the sufferings of far-away Christians were forgotten once more and honourable and right honourable gentlemen stalled their consciences with the usual comfortable palliatives. For over thirty years these palliatives of the Chanceries continued to be the only solatium for the griefs of Christian races suffering under Moslem rule.

The Moslem is admirable in his place in the world, and has filled a glorious epoch in its history. But that place is not as overlord to the Christian in these days. It is not so much a question of Moslem fanaticism, of intermittent periods of fury and revolting massacres, as so many people seem to think. Indeed, under such rule the Christian also developed ferocious instincts and learned to massacre with all the fervour, and none of the excuse, of the Moslem, whose very religion urges to the extermination of the Giaour. Massacre as a political method has had its place in the history of all—even the most civilised—nations, and the world readily forgives and quickly forgets these blots upon humanity. But where the Moslem sins beyond forgiveness in these utilitarian days is in the dead negation of all progress which seems inseparable from Moslem rule. No sane man will play the apologist for massacre, yet few thinking men will deny that, like most violent measures, it has at least a stimulating effect upon average manhood. If occasional revolting massacres in Macedonia had been divided by periods of progress and prosperity the fate of the Turk might well have been widely different. But lands uncultivated, natural resources left undeveloped, spell a nemesis more terrible than any vengeance ever taken in history for occasional outrages on the common feelings of humanity. It is not the ferocity of Mohammedanism but its incapacity,

except under alien guidance, for peaceful development and progress that has brought the Turk in our day to the bar of the world's judgment and earned a verdict of universal condemnation.

Many a Macedonian home is built upon consecutive layers of the ashes of former Christian homes. Sad as the sight must be, and appalling as the pictures of bloodshed it recalls, these things are rightly a mere nothing to the eye of the statesman in comparison with the story told by the deserted soil crying aloud to every civilised instinct for cultivation through a succession of empty and unprofitable years. The Bulgarians have been freed barely a generation from that dead negation of progress which is synonymous with Moslem rule. Yet any traveller can bear witness to the lesson impressed upon any man not blind or deaf who passes from the well-tilled fields, the teeming harvests, and the thriving industries of Bulgaria to the idle fields and waste lands under Turkish rule. The soil is no less rich there and the population is likewise Christian, potentially in no wise inferior to the Bulgar. These things have been noted by traveller and statesman, have been commented on by the publicist for many years past. But the complex barrier erected by the Berlin Congress, permeable only to the Germanic Powers, still continued to act as a bulwark of defence to the procrastinating Turk.

In the spring of 1912 statesmen were beginning to be uneasy once more about the Balkans. Somewhat later there was talk of a federation of the Balkan States. The Russian Ambassador at Constantinople, M. Charikov, acting independently and against the tenor of his instructions, made proposals which included Macedonia as a Balkan State and suggested federation under the headship of—Turkey. He was recalled by his indignant Emperor literally at a moment's notice, by telegram, and degraded in rank. Such a thing had not happened in the Russian diplomatic body for over thirty years.* By autumn matters had so far

* M. Charikov had been the right-hand man of M. Izvolsky, and it is worth noting that, with one exception, all the representatives of Russia in the capitals of the Balkan States who had held these posts under M. Izvolsky, were changed. The one exception was M. Hartwig, at Belgrade, who, himself of the first rank (a former Adjunct-Minister of Foreign Affairs and a candidate for yet higher honours), was no follower of M. Izvolsky. It should be said, in this connection, that M. Hartwig is an Orthodox Slav and Russian to the backbone, notwitstanding his German name, the significance of which was lost in the family generations ago.

developed for the worse that Russia sought a mandate from her friends to intervene to prevent war. Some delay ensued, whether owing to the customary deliberation of diplomatic action or to unwillingness to enter on a path that seemed likely to lead a long way in comparative darkness. In the interval war broke out and the "one word from Russia," which might have prevented hostilities, was never spoken—through no fault of Russia. The rapid and overwhelming success of the Balkan Allies at once commanded the respect of Europe, and the status quo, after thirty-four years of troubled life, disappeared for ever, with the Turk, from the battlefields of Kumanovo and Kirk Kilesseh, and the coveted harbours of Salonika.

The Balkan Peninsula thus ceased to be divided horizontally east and west by a corridor of convenience for Germanic progress towards the Orient. Diplomacy went to work upon the ruins of the Berlin status quo of 1878 to evolve something which should safeguard the peace of Europe, in hourly jeopardy from the collapse of the Turk and the consequent loss of the Teuton's most cherished hopes.

A glance at the map will suffice to show that Austria's position has become a more uncomfortable one than ever since the victories of the orthodox Christians in the Balkans. Her fears are natural and not ill-founded. If the whole area of Turkish dominion in Europe should pass into the hands of the Balkan Allies, not only would the Germanic Powers suffer the negative disadvantage of being cut off from the realisation of their cherished ambitions but they might be menaced by a positive danger. The spectre of a new Great Power arising in the Balkans, an orthodox Christian and Slav Great Power in the south, almost inevitably on the closest terms with the great Slav Empire of the North, suggested to Austria that her national existence demanded some issue out of a situation uncomfortably resembling that between the upper and the nether millstones. The exact terms of the Triple Alliance have not been made known, but it is certain that anything which threatens the national existence of one is a *casus belli* for all the members of the alliance. Moreover, as behind the Southern Slavs stood Russia with her unconquerable impulse towards ice-free seas, it required no very lively imagination to foresee a future combination of interests that would bring a Russian

railway to the Adriatic, lose the Triple Alliance the support of Austrian "Dreadnoughts," and complete the alienation of Italy. There were other possibilities in the situation, but in all the loss must fall first and heaviest upon Austria. No small factor in the problem is the composite nature of the Dual Empire, with its score of nationalities. Already the Slav element outnumbers in voting strength the Teutonic element in Austria-Hungary. The army reflects the composition of the nation, a fact which suggests very great risks in the event of war with a Slav country. Altogether the potentialities before Austria were of such a nature as perhaps to excuse, as they certainly explain, the somewhat hysterical attitude of powerful sections of her public during the crisis.

At the outset Austria threatened the Balkan Allies with war if their troops entered the sanjak of Novibazar, apparently forgetting that Baron Aehrenthal had expressly renounced all rights to the famous corridor "jusqu'au delà de Mitrovitza" of the Berlin Treaty.* War was again threatened to prevent victorious Servia securing sovereign rights over a portion of the Adriatic seaboard. Russia deftly turned the Austrian position by recommending Servia to content herself, under adequate guarantees, with free commercial access only, without enjoying sovereign rights over the territory crossed to reach an Adriatic port. The conduct of these negotiations was such as to create several panics in Europe, and the results can hardly have been satisfactory to Austria or her friends. It was evident that the diplomacy of the Triple Alliance had not yet found an adequate solution of the difficulties presented by the overthrow of the Berlin status quo of 1878.

"The Balkan Peninsula was divided horizontally in 1878 . . . now we'll divide it vertically, from north to south," is what the Triple Alliance appear to have said to themselves. The diplomatic formula was ready to hand. Some twelve months or more before the Balkan War broke out, Austria, in the tentative and informal manner in which diplomacy tests doubtful ground

* Berlin Treaty, Art. 25. Austria's renunciation of the sanjak is Art. 1 of the Austro-Turkish Accord of 1909, and runs, "L'Autriche-Hongrie déclare renoncer d'une façon expresse à tous les droits qui lui ont été conférés par rapport à l'ancien sanjak de Novibazar."

before taking a step, had put forward a new panacea for the grievances of the Balkan Christians in the form of a proposal to create a new State and call it Albania. The Albanians are Moslems and banditti: under the fostering rule of Turkey they had long been in the habit of descending from their mountain fastnesses upon the Christian villages in the plains, ousting the peaceful owners of choice spots and settling there themselves. At the time the proposal was made Albanians were in possession of scattered bits of land over a considerable extent of territory. I never heard exactly how Austria claimed that the invention of a new Moslem State would benefit the Balkan Christians or facilitate the introduction of law and order into harassed Macedonia, but it matters little. Russia and her friends put carefully aside, with all due forms of diplomatic politeness, the "feelers" of Austria on this matter, and, of course, it dropped. When casting around for some method of securing the necessary diplomatic *point d'appui* for effecting a division of the Balkan Peninsula vertically from north to south, these abortive proposals about Albania were recalled to mind, and promptly put to use. The now customary sabre-rattling accompanied this, as all the other demands, of the Triple Alliance. It must be admitted that there was a certain amount of "nerve" about urging on the Powers of the Triple Entente proposals that had already been set aside before the trouble in the Balkans began, and when one reflects that at the moment of the renewal of these unwelcome proposals the territory affected was in the occupation of the victorious allies the "nerve" of the Germanic Powers becomes still more marked. At least it serves to indicate how desperate the situation was felt to be for one of the members of the Triple Alliance.

Russia accepted the principle of the proposals, but reserved the question of frontier delimitation. Austria's idea of the future frontiers of Albania covers a large extent of valuable territory now in the occupation of the Balkan Allies. Russia thinks Albania should be the mountain ranges along the seaboard that have always been in the occupation of the Albanians, and should not include the lands sporadically scattered up and down among peaceful Christian populations in the plains. The dispute is still in its early stages and no solution is in sight at the time

of writing. Indeed, it seems by no means improbable that no solution is intended to be reached until a decision has been come to on the larger question of whether the potentialities of the general situation do or do not justify the Triple Alliance in its own eyes in a resort to arms. Russia, in defiance of public opinion which bitterly upbraids the Foreign Office for this concession, has yielded the principle: she will hardly yield the details of the Triple Alliance scheme of future policy which underlies the "invention of Albania" proposal. Herein lies the first great danger to the peace of Europe.

In one other quarter also there is danger no less menacing—from the side of Turkey. The provocation given to Russia during a succession of years by Turkish action in Persia is unknown or unappreciated by the British public. It has been very great and only the tolerance with which Great Powers, conscious of their strength, can sometimes afford to ignore for long the provocation which is always going on, has prevented more serious trouble that could not have escaped the notice of Great Britain. That cloud has passed: Turkey has evacuated the territory seized and administered by her in Persia with ultimate aims which reveal in all probability the guiding hand of a great military Power whose counsels are always at the service of Turkey. But there are other forms of provocation that no State can endure. There is now in Russia serious apprehension as to the effect of final defeat upon the brave but misled Turkish people. In the desperate hope of bettering her fallen fortunes by setting all Europe ablaze, Turkey in the exasperation of defeat might be guilty of forms of provocation which Russia must not and dare not overlook.

Russia wants peace. The late premier, M. Stolîpin, told the writer * that he estimated another ten years would be needed to make good his great agrarian settlement, which is the foundation of all the reform of the present age in Russia. Peace is essential to the steady development of this fundamental reform. The present Premier, M. Kokovtsov, has repeatedly emphasised Russia's earnest desire for continued peace in which to develop her share of the world's surface—one-sixth of the land surface of the globe! Russia seeks no territorial aggrandisement any-

* In December 1910.

where; her task for long enough to come must be to utilise what she has. Her Foreign Minister, M. Sazonov, proposed to the Powers *désintéressement* as a guiding principle for the Concert of Europe, and by that principle Russia absolutely abides. After years of sore trial, of humiliation abroad and darkness at home, Russia has emerged stronger than ever before. It is significant that, for the first time in her later history, the strength of Russia now lies not merely in her re-organised and re-equipped fighting forces, but in the heavy metal also of her treasury coffers. She has devoted for half a dozen years past the best of her energies and the larger part of her resources to the strengthening of her fighting forces, not for any purposes of aggression in any direction, but, as M. Kokovtsov pithily puts it, because "every prudent man erects a satisfactory fence about his land before he proceeds to till it." Her finances have never before been in such brilliant condition, thanks largely to a succession of good harvests and favourable markets, her commerce and her industries are increasing—in fact, she is on the top of the wave of prosperity which the law of the pendulum that rules all things in the universe has decreed as some compensation for the evil years through which she passed so recently.

The world has been carefully instructed from sources inspired by the forces of Germanism and Jewry that Russia is playing a game of bluff, that she dreads the shadow of war lest the red flag of anarchy should again be flaunted in the land, reviving the disorders of 1905. As a matter of fact, the forces of anarchy have been dispersed and crushed—they are leavening the lump in other lands, unhappily in England also!—the Duma is in being and it rests with the nation to utilise this new organ for the attainment of national aims. While the Duma lives there is no room for serious attempts at reform by violence, nor can any such movement again win the wide sympathies that made the troubles of 1905 possible. The truth of this matter is quite other. The gallant fight for freedom in the Balkans has stirred the blood of Russians as it has not been stirred by any foreign event for a generation past. If the forces of disintegration were in the least formidable nowadays in Russia she might well be tempted to make war as the sure and certain means of reuniting the whole nation. Happily Russia's love of peace has no such shaky

foundation: it is based on the only sound policy for a country of such vast extent with a hundred and fifty millions of people engaged now, and for long to come, in the task of readjusting themselves to the new conditions of life introduced by the new régime. Russia desires to "till her land in peace": it is a sincere desire based on a sound policy. But Russia is ready to fight if the magnanimity of her tolerance be overstrained by any who fail to understand and appreciate. The two Empires of Great Britain and Russia occupy about the same area of the world's surface—but how vast, in many respects, the difference between them. At the present anxious moment one is struck rather perhaps by the difference from the military point of view. The British Empire is vulnerable at a thousand points, and at scores of these might be bled into submission and her heritage divided by the spoiler. Yet she takes no steps even in these days of fast approaching peril to erect a satisfactory fence—not of friendships that may fail in the hour of utmost need, but of the true steel that never betrays the stout heart.

How different is the position of Russia! In the midst of a change in the form of Government that touches every single interest and every man in the land, she has devoted her first care to what M. Kokovtsov called the duty of every prudent man "to erect a satisfactory fence about his land before he begins to till it." Yet all the while Russia knows that, at the worst, her Empire is unconquerable whatever forces may be brought against it. Partly this is due to the solidarity of her territory, but more largely still to the fundamentally simple structure of the Russian State.* Russia would still be Russia if driven—as certain German writers have boastfully hinted—beyond the Urals, which present no barriers to a return that would be disastrous to any foe or combination of foes. Therefore, Russia, desirous of peace but ready to fight for good cause, pursues a policy of absolute calm, saying, in smooth-turned diplomatic phrase what is said more simply in conversation: "We want peace, but if any one—any one—wants war they can have it to-morrow!"

VICTOR E. MARSDEN.

* The new institutions in Russia are, and will long remain, without sufficient effect upon the State to invalidate the truth.

THE POST IMPRESSIONIST

The spirit of unrest has invaded the arts. Literature and philosophy have surrendered and painting is threatened. It seems that all schools are wrong. The great masters of the past did not know their business. The real mystery of painting, withheld through all the centuries, has at last been revealed to a few cranks from Montmartre whom the world treated with indifference, until the critics in want of something new to say thrust them upon the attention of a long-suffering public. Like all of the grosser absurdities, the appeal is principally to women, and any day you may find the Grafton Galleries congested with ecstatic females from the suburbs in search of culture. Those of us who are old enough to remember the æsthetic craze of the eighties notice a curious similarity in the faithful. The same wan women wander round with the same shambling men, talking aggressively the jargon of the modern school and hoping against hope they are shocking the public. One great quality of success no one can deny the modern : he is not handicapped by any undue modesty.

In the catalogue of the present exhibition at the Grafton Galleries, one of the many prefaces, this in particular by a gentleman who claims that " Happily there is no need to be defensive—the battle is won." This is, of course, a very old trick of advocacy, to commence an argument by assuming everything disputable in your own favour. It is curious if the victory has been so decisive that a comparatively small exhibition of pictures should require three apologies. In fact, there is more apology than catalogue. Material victory is claimed one supposes by the numbers who have come to see. If so, it is the kind of success most people would find more humiliating than failure, and is best explained by the comment of an old attendant, who, on being

asked how the exhibition was doing, replied, "Splendidly, sir! This sort of thing draws much better than pictures."

There is one fact that makes sober folk a little sceptical about all these modern revelations. It is curious what an odd trick their prophets have of being mad—the faithful seem to prefer it, and worship with all the devotion of the Arab to a mad Mullah. It may be due to the eastern influence in art of which one hears so much, which has introduced this superstitious respect for lunacy from the Orient. But from Nietzsche to Van Gogh, to say nothing of Strindberg, the taint is there. Mr. Roger Fry is not nearly so cocksure. That at least 50 per cent. of the work exhibited could be produced without the smallest technical skill is obvious to the simplest observer; still, Mr. Fry plaintively points out that Cezanne at any rate could paint. But then Cezanne can hardly be claimed by the post impressionists; they almost reject him as an imitative. His pictures have some resemblance to the objects they depict. You can tell his flower-studies belong to the vegetable kingdom, which reduces him at once to an academic level. In this country we hardly know his work except by his pictures of still life, which, while they have a certain decorative charm of design and colour, do not take us very far in a rather uninteresting school. In the present exhibition there are some water-colour sketches full of suggestion and feeling, although indefinite, even as studies, which make one suspect that perhaps we have not seen his best work so far in England; but Mr. Fry has to admit that one of the masters of the post-impressionist school was a custom-house officer, who painted without any training in the art, and in the intervals of examining luggage produced effects we are asked to admire as imaginative and inspired. It is also a fact that the two founders, Van Gogh and Gauguin, never attempted to paint until they were too old to learn the elements of their business. Van Gogh himself admits: "Any figure that I paint is generally dreadful even in my own eyes; how much more hideous it must be therefore in other peoples." (*The Letters of a Post Impressionist*, p. 69.)

The theory of the school it seems is this. Hitherto painting has been regarded as objective, its aim to represent something existing and seen. This is quite wrong, and is airily disposed of as imitative art. You may as well have a coloured photograph.

It is this bourgeois desire that a picture should resemble something that is at the bottom of all the trouble. Mr. Fry explains the new gospel thus: "These artists do not seek to imitate form but create form, not to imitate life but to find an equivalent for life." In case this is too hard a saying, he is kind enough to explain. "By that I mean that they wish to make images, which by the clearness of their logical structure and by their closely knit unity of texture shall appeal to our disinterested and contemplative imagination, with something of the same vividness as the things of actual life appeal to our practical activities. In fact, they aim not at illusion but reality." This is an example of the most irritating of all modern affectations; the word-game which consists in arranging a certain collocation of pompous words and pretending that they have a meaning, a sort of post-intelligent composition. When from all this pretentious stuff any meaning escapes, the nonsense is obvious and the absurdity of the school is patent.

The representation of any object and reality are two different things: a tree is real, its picture however treated can only suggest it. In fact this new school is more divorced from reality than the old. You must not paint a tree, you must produce the idea of a tree, so you are to achieve reality by suggesting an idea, as if the actual and the ideal were not a contradiction in terms. It would be just as reasonable to ask Bishop Berkeley to write an appreciation of the philosophical principles of Mr. Locke. It is not surprising that the high priest of this crazy stuff should have died a raving lunatic.

Mr. Fry cannot make even his own nonsense coherent. He admits that to be sincere the artist ought to give up all resemblance to natural form. What they do is a dishonest compromise. They paint a woman, which still can be recognised as human, and then to avoid imitative art give her six toes. So you may still imitate as long as you imitate something that is not there, or as it is put by one of their admirers: "They are independent of place or time or a particular civilisation or point of view." "Theirs is an art which stands on its own feet (with six toes) instead of leaning on life" (with five); so to make quite sure the feet are your own you give them six toes and art is saved. Thus you have achieved a "passionate attempt to express profound

emotion." It is wonderful what can be accomplished by a toe more or less. The absurdity of the new gospel is self-evident. There is no greater blunder in art than to try and express one kind of art in the medium of another. It is the bedrock of all artistic error, yet we are told pictures are to be "pieces of music." You must "create a purely abstract language of form, a visual music."

Was there ever such hare-brained chatter? A picture has about as much to do with music as with mathematics. In fact less, for Picasso, who, at any rate, has the honesty of his delusions, paints pictures of human beings which resemble nothing but the figures in the second book of Euclid. How far the cubists are sincere or not must be a matter of conjecture. One cannot help suspecting they have been hoaxing the credulous critics. At any rate, the managers of the Grafton Galleries have some sense of shame, if, as we understand, a grotesque performance originally called "Madonna and Christ" has been tempered to the shorn public under the description of "Mother and Child."

Then, again, this cant of representing the idea of things. This is a province not of pictorial art but literature, and the newest phase is merely a return to the literary art which was the bane of the mid-Victorian school. The only difference is that you are painting, as it were, a story by Mr. Henry James instead of by Mrs. Henry Wood. Then we are told we must seek simplicity and return to the primitives Pure colour and elimination of chiaroscuro are the two dogmas of the new primitives. All drawing of course ceases to count—atmosphere is wrong. Rembrandt, it appears, was a very inferior practitioner to the ingenious gentleman who used to design the advertisements of Mr. Taylor's repository and his receptive vans. The reasoning is this, because the primitives had not discovered the secret of aerial perspective, that therefore we are to pretend that we live in a world of two dimensions. It sounds like the wisdom of one of the professors of Laputa. It cannot be denied that many of the contributors to the Grafton Galleries have gone back far enough, almost to the stone age of art, the paving-stone age, for their efforts would compare quite favourably with the chalked mackerel and shipwreck of Piccadilly. "Any form in which an artist can express himself is legitimate." Such is the simple faith of the post

impressionist, who, in the same breath, tells us that all art except his own is false, and herein lies the weak spot of the movement. With its pioneers Van Gogh and Gauguin the art was at any rate sincere; with all its faults it was the expression of one mad and another brutal personality, but what is the use of a blameless cockney supporting a wife and family in South Kensington pretending he sees life like an absinthe sodden haunter of Montmartre. It is like trying to run a Quartier Latin cabaret in Regent Street. One may dislike the work of Van Gogh and Gauguin, but it is entitled to the credit of being an effort in an original if repulsive direction. Their imitators are merely conventional, as conventional as the Victorians they despise.

The Victorian efforts were bad enough with their false sentiment and cheap prettiness, but even that is better than falser brutality and cheaper ugliness. In so far as the new movement is an effort to bring fresh air into an exhausted atmosphere it may be sane and wholesome. Even the foolish chatter about imitativeness has this germ of truth in it, that a more literal transcript from nature may be no more artistic than a photograph, and that a devotion to beauty may degenerate into mere prettiness. The Victorian art fell into both these quagmires, but these simple truths are a good deal older than post impressionism. Still beauty in some form is essential to a work of art. Degas painted repulsive subjects—low drinking-bars, ungainly ballet girls—but none the less his pictures were as beautiful as the peasants of Millet and Israel.

The impressionists reminded us that it was the treatment and not the subject that mattered, and breathed colour and life into a drab and dead world of art, and in the course of time persuaded even the critics that the last word in art had not been spoken by the contemporary academicians. After their advent anecdotal art became the butt of the very critics who had applauded it most. A great deal of nonsense has been talked about anecdotal pictures. Some one invented the phrase and the critics, always like sheep ready to follow, worked it to death. A little reflection would show us that all the greatest masterpieces of the world are anecdotal pictures. A picture does not have to be anecdotal because the subject is taken from mythology or Holy Writ.

The fault of the Victorian pictures was not that they told

stories, but that the painting was subordinate to the subject. Instead of the story being an excuse for the painting the painting was an excuse for the story. The artist was endeavouring to express one art in the terms of another, just as the post impressionists are endeavouring to express subjective emotions in the terms of an objective art. The impressionists saved us from much but they did one ill-service—they made post impressionism possible. The poor critics came such a cropper over the impressionists they have been apprehensive ever since. They were not going to be caught twice. At any risk they must not be old-fashioned and suspected of being behind the modern feeling. Then it is a great relief to have something new to say. The public are sure to follow. It is like the fairy story of the king's new clothes. Imaginary beauties are pointed out until people are afraid to trust the verdict of their own eyes. It is a sort of Christian Science adapted to the fine arts. You think an ill picture well done and it is. In a sceptical age there is nothing people will not believe if it is only sufficiently ridiculous.

The following extract from one of Van Gogh's letters is not without interest:

> A certain anecdote about Giotto strikes me as being very neat. There was a prize competition opened for the best picture of the Virgin, and a host of sketches were sent in to the judging committee of fine arts of the day. The one signed by Giotto was a simple oval, a plain, egg-shaped space. The jury, entirely confident although perplexed, gave Giotto the commission for the picture. (*The Letters of a Post Impressionist*, p. 58.)

We recommend this story to the attention of "the judging committee of the Grafton Galleries."

The stock phrase of these critics on the run is self-expression. The object of art is to express one's personality—all this rather priggish phrase means is, that good art must be sincere, and that if an artist has nothing original to say he had better hold his tongue, but the moderns confuse the means with the end, and talk as if self-expression in itself were a virtue. The fallacy is obvious. Because a good picture must be sincere, it does not follow sincerity will produce a good picture. The virtue of self-expression must depend a good deal on the personality to be expressed. Some of the recent manifestations amount almost to an indecent exposure.

The pictures of Van Gogh and Gauguin are much more

intelligible when we find out what manner of men they were. Van Gogh was an amiable, weak-minded man, whose efforts to succeed in an art for which he had few qualifications turned a brain never very strong, and he died in a lunatic asylum. Gauguin was a different personality, so disagreeable an eccentric that even Bohemian Paris found him intolerable—a vain, vulgar poseur—he could only find a society congenial to his nature in the most repulsive form of savage life. In fact, the only thing so far that has been discovered in favour of the Tahitans is, that they were probably not so bad as Gauguin painted them. One is not surprised to learn that it was Gauguin's society and art that finally drove Van Gogh mad. In Julius Meier-Graefe's monumental work on modern art, vol. ii, p. 61, we read :

> Van Gogh was irritated into one of his most violent attacks of mania by being with his friend, with whom he disagreed on many points, and whose individuality, setting aside his art, was the exact opposite of his own. One evening, as Gauguin tells us in a recent manuscript, he flung a glass at his friend's head in a tavern ; Gauguin retreated and on the following morning told his remorseful comrade that he should prefer to quit Arles, and that he should tell Van Gogh's brother Theodore about the matter (upon whom the simple artist had lived for many years). Vincent said nothing; but in the evening he attacked Gauguin in the street with a razor ; Gauguin managed to restrain him, whereupon Van Gogh went home and cut his own ear off at the root.

Then Gauguin, to the relief of his acquaintance, departed to Tahiti, where he was reported to have died of leprosy. This has been contradicted, a contradiction which, it is understood, gave great relief in post-impressionist circles, as showing that even Gauguin knew where to draw the line. Such were the two masters. So their works become almost articulate. The self-expression of a latent maniac and a patent savage.

But now Matisse is brought in to reinforce the others. He is mainly represented at the Post-Impressionist Exhibition by a grotesque picture which looks like an advertisement of Swan and Edgar's, and an enormous study of nude women dancing on a hill. This is claimed as the last word of rhythmic art. The figures are hideous and ungainly. The only merit is in the line of the figure on the extreme left, which is a bold piece of drawing. The picture has also an interest, as the artist has returned to the Victorian convention of painting nude figures pink, in order to gain a meretricious colour-effect : any sense of movement is entirely absent. One has only to compare this crude amorphous

composition with the dancing peasants of Rubens in the Museo del Prado at Madrid, to see how completely Matisse has missed his aim.

At the Grafton Galleries there are many beautiful works—in particular some delightful specimens of Monsieur Flandrin's charming art. But the appeal of all these pictures is a refutation of the post-impressionist case. It is based upon all the methods the post impressionists reject. They are all not merely frankly imitative but successfully imitative. The only pictures which follow in sincerity the theories of the school are the cubists, for whom even Mr. Fry can find no excuse, and which have now been very properly removed from an exhibition which takes the money of the public. The latest defence discovered by no less an authority than the *Times* in a leading article is this. That, as regards the artists, post impressionism is merely a symptom and not a disease; but perhaps from an artistic point of view a symptom is the most repulsive part of disease; and for the critics, that while it is possible they may not be " literary parasites who talk pretentious and futile nonsense," at any rate they do not paint post-impressionist pictures themselves. Unfortunately they do, and remind us once more of that famous definition of Lord Beaconsfield, which if it be not an excuse, is certainly an explanation of much that the public have had to suffer of late.

MONTPELIER.

A SERVANT'S VIEW OF THE SERVANT PROBLEM

JUDGING from the number of magazine and newspaper articles which have lately appeared dealing more or less with the subject, it is evident that the acute aspect presented by the problem has compelled a growing and a wider interest being manifested in the physical, moral, social, and economical condition of the domestic worker. As a unit in that vast body of indispensable concomitants of home comfort, I heartily welcome this attention.

In the November (1912) number of the *National Review*, Lady Willoughby de Broke narrated the result of her experience and observation on the various characteristics of the average servant, putting quite a kindly complexion on their faults and foibles, their ideals and aspirations, while advocating a keener interest being adopted by employers in the lives of those fellow creatures who are obliged to perform for them—often under adverse circumstances—duties described as "menial."

For her efforts in this direction Lady Willoughby de Broke deserves the thanks of all intelligent servants, and it is to be hoped that the good feeling engendered by the glamour of her ladyship's pen will meet with an adequate response.

In the February number of the *National Review*, Mrs. Home McCall renews the subject with an article in the course of which she impresses the need for early training of maids, especially those destined to serve in small households—an aspect of the question with which I am entirely sympathetic. Both ladies having thus been permitted to express their respective opinions in the position of employers, perhaps a domestic worker of many years' varied experience may be allowed to contribute a word of criticism, to offer a few remedial suggestions, from the servant's standpoint.

The relationship existing between mistress and maid is properly constituted by the oral agreement accepted by both parties at the period of engagement; one individual to perform certain duties for another, in return for a monetary or other remuneration—that is, instead of being guided by her own will, to submit herself to perform in certain matters the will of another. The extent of duties embraced in the contract may vary very much according to the size of the establishment. There too often exist a vagueness and elasticity about the limit of duties, and one frequently finds the mistress inclined to exact more than the maid is willing to give.

There are very good reasons why mistresses should not consider themselves as having a right to a full command and exercise of power over their servants in all things, rather that in all things not within the contract they ought to be ready to admit a certain degree of equality between the two parties—not to regard themselves as the possessors of the souls, as well as the bodies, of their maids at all times and in all places. Acting thus they exercise an authority and assume a superiority in matters quite beyond the general terms of the contract.

On the other hand, maids, I admit, often carelessly and grudgingly perform the duties they have undertaken, evincing but scanty attention to the interests of the mistress. Those causes of discontent produce in the majority of cases the baneful results of which current writers complain.

The practical remedy and its application is an easy one. That the mistress and maid should equally learn: that in all other respects and at all other times the contracting parties are not necessarily in the position of superior and inferior, but, unless from some other cause, are to be regarded as on a footing of equality. The mistress buys, the maid sells; the thing bought and sold is labour. Attaining a clear conviction on this point, one recognises that the true relationship existing between mistress and maid is one of mutual independence. Thrown much together, however, under the same roof, a spirit of courtesy and good feeling ought—and in many houses does—temper the intercourse to the benefit of both parties.

But what are the real facts? The mistress has hitherto been accustomed to look upon her maids as something quite outside

of herself. She will be surprised to learn there is an organic connection between the life the maid lives and that led by herself. To one behind the scenes the terms of their relationship are obvious. Thus, when a young girl enters service she at once sacrifices all freedom. Any preconceived notion she may entertain of living her life in a particular way must be dismissed. She becomes the creature of her environment, which is determined by the habits and tastes of the family with whom she lives. Her opportunities for self-culture or improvement are small indeed; fruitful application is almost impossible. If she seek abroad for society in which she may meet with helpful friendship she finds herself shunned. She is a domestic servant! A Slavey! And as the devotees of caste and snobbery will for this reason ignore her, she naturally regards service with loathing, and yearns with a nameless anguish for the day of her emancipation.

I think it is generally conceded that the average maid's working hours are far too long. She rises before seven o'clock in the morning, and is on duty from fourteen to sixteen hours, with brief intervals for meals—practically seven days of the week.

During these long hours—even meal hours—she is expected to be always on the alert; to undertake when desired or ordered, fresh work, often involving considerable time, trouble, and physical exertion, while at the same time forming a formidable addition to her usual everyday duties. She has to meet all sorts of unforeseen situations; to evade difficulties, frequently demanding the astuteness of a diplomat. She has to rise to all occasions calling for lively if not altogether lofty flights of imagination. To hear many things; yet be deaf. See many things; yet be blind. In a word, the successful maid must combine the patience of Job, the wisdom of Solomon, the wit of a Sheridan, with the dignified bearing of a princess.

Her responsibilities extend to the temporary absence of the family, when she is frequently entrusted with the sole charge of a large house containing quantities of gold and silver articles, jewellery, plate, priceless bric-à-brac, notable pictures and engravings, costly books, also heirlooms, endowed with a sentimental value to the members of the family, which no sum of money, however large, could replace. On how few occasions is it found that the confidence reposed in the maid's care and integrity, has

been abused or misplaced. Yet any departure from convention on her part is sternly reproved. Any failure to face an emergency, or to adopt the initiative at the proper moment, meets with insinuations of inaptness. Should she make a suggestion in any difficulty, she is at once reminded of her position.

Mistresses are the last to discover, the first to deny our merits. If we succeed, such an event takes them utterly by surprise; and that surprise, on reflection, usually cools down into envy. Too often does a mistress represent facts of our past life, as being all shadow, with no redeeming flash of limelight.

Surely, a life lived from day to day under such trying, nerve-shattering, and exhausting conditions, supports Mr. Arnold Bennett's description of the domestic servant as being "a dehumanised drudge," and calls for ameliorative measures being taken on the part of all employers, to extend consideration, sympathy, and forbearance to those who, sometimes for long periods, live under the same roof, breathe the same air, sorrow and rejoice, hope and fear, court success and failure, and go through the entire puppet-show of this fitful, feverish streak of existence called life. The paramount source of grievance with the majority of domestic workers, is the totally inadequate hours usually allowed for freedom and relaxation. One short evening, and a portion of every alternate Sunday, in a week comprising seven working days, is merely a farce. Even that dear, delectable, treasured institution, the weekly evening out, is constantly liable to curtailment, not infrequently to complete absorption, and can never really—in any sense of the word—be depended upon, as on this particular evening the employer may have "a few friends coming." There is not the slightest difficulty in adjusting housework so as to allow of a maid who performs her duty carefully, and to the best of her ability, enjoying a portion of every day, set apart as her very own—more especially in the spring and summer months. Menservants are nearly always granted this privilege, which is to a woman more, much more, than a privilege; its observance is an absolute necessity for the preservation of good health.

Social ostracism, long hours, and lack of freedom form the principal grievances of domestic workers, and are the most serious obstacles which prevent a better class of girl entering

service. Were these obstacles removed, or an attempt made in that direction, no matter upon how diminutive a scale, the standard of character and efficiency would be raised. Thus with the entrance of a higher class of maid there must naturally be effected a change in the attitude of the mistress, and the vexatious question of the scarcity of efficient maids would have gone far on the way towards an amicable solution.

Mistresses of "the stately homes of England," the town or country mansion, the city flat, the suburban villa, how often under a cloak of frigid hauteur, or chronic umbrage, do you fail to realise, or realising, ignore the glaring fact, that our physical disabilities are identical with your own? Our hearts pulsate just as tenderly as yours to every phase of human emotion.

We can be moved to tears by the exquisite tone-poems of Chopin, our feet respond to the terpsichorean allurements of the popular rag-time air. We possess brains sufficiently developed, enabling us to assimilate the best of English and foreign literature. We can appreciate the beauty and majesty of nature, as pictured in the face of the universe. For us, as for you, the landscape and seascape never cease to please. The flowers we love, because they give pleasure by merely living. We can gather hope from the rose of a wintry dawn, and indulge in pensive reflections under the roseate effulgence of a summer sunset.

When for you, as also for us, the drama of life is ended—the curtain dropped—the lights extinguished—Death will be found on the doorstep of the exit, beckoning the mistress with the same hand as he will inevitably extend to the maid.

Isolated from home, friends, relations, and all the scenes and ties of fondly cherished youthful remembrances, to whom can we look but you for the kindly word of encouragement and guidance, the recognition of deserved merit, the exercise of that magnetic, indefinable something, understandable between woman and woman, which will enable us to feel we too have a part in the fair fabric of civilisation, we too occupy a place of utility in the ranks of living men and women, joining in the grand march of this great Empire down the avenues of Time and History?

NELLIE LOCKHART ANDERSON.

AMERICAN AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON, *February* 8, 1913

EVERY four years, beginning in November and ending about the middle of February, the American people engage in the great national pastime of Cabinet making. With the election of the President, press and public kindly relieve him of the labour of selecting his "constitutional advisers" and make up the Cabinet according to their respective tastes or ideas. Most Presidents show peculiar disregard for this unsought advice and act on their own judgment, but this discourages no one. The day after election the newspapers pick their men just as certain newspapers "tip their winners" on the turf, and they have kept it up ever since. The political tipster has an advantage over the sporting editor in that the field of selection is wider, and he has only to mention every possible or impossible person to be able later on "to point with pride" (the joy of every journalist) to his successful prediction, for some at least of his random shots are bound to hit the mark. Presidents, however, have been known to spring surprises and to give fame to the unknown. Usually the President-Elect gives an intimation of his purpose shortly after his election, but sometimes the Cabinet has been a secret until inauguration. Governor Wilson, up to this time, has admitted no one to his confidence.

It is curious the intense interest taken in the Cabinet when one remembers that in the United States the Cabinet has neither power nor responsibility, as those terms are understood in the English system of government. The Cabinet has not the power to enact legislation, nor is it held responsible for the legislation enacted. That is the sole function of Congress. It is true that a member of the Cabinet can suggest the enactment of a law which he considers necessary, but so can any one else. The

recommendation of a member of the Cabinet is treated with a certain amount of respect, as he is supposed to have practical knowledge of his subject and the benefit of the experts of his department, but the same deference is paid to a measure championed by a voluntary association of good standing whose members have no official relation with the Government. But in either case it is a suggestion only, and to be treated with as much or as little respect as Congress may be disposed to give it. The Cabinet cannot coerce Congress, it cannot threaten to resign or to force an election, while Congress can make things very unpleasant for the Cabinet and seriously hamper it. In England, of course, the Cabinet is the Government; it not only initiates legislation but enacts it, it is responsible for success or failure, and the fate of the party rests with the Cabinet. In the United States the most inconspicuous member of Congress has more real power than the Secretary of State, who is the American Premier, yet in public estimation greater importance attaches to the Cabinet than to members of Congress, with the exception of a few members of great prominence. The Cabinet is the political Mahommed's coffin suspended between the heaven of Congress and the earth of the Presidency. Its proper function is simply to execute the laws which Congress has passed, and in their execution it is given very little discretion, but what discretion is permitted is always subject to the approval of the President. When a law is passed conferring upon the head of a department authority to make regulations to carry the law into effect, those regulations must have the approval of the President, and if there is a conflict of opinion between the President and the Secretary it is the Secretary who must yield.

The public is always anxious to know the names of the men who will constitute the Cabinet because of the tradition that it gives a line on the President, and that is valuable when the President is new to public life and has to be taken largely on trust. But there is little in this fiction. Given the President, one may not know the names of the men who will be near to him, but it is not difficult to forecast the kind of men they will be or what they stand for. McKinley's advisers were unlike those Roosevelt selected, Roosevelt's of a type different to Taft's,

Wilson's with very little in common with those of his predecessor. Mr. Wilson has said that none but Progressives will be in his Cabinet, and with that as a basis the rest is merely a matter of detail.

American Presidents, like British Premiers, are not given an absolutely free hand in the make-up of their Cabinet. Expediency, rivalries, future political profit, must be considered, so that here, as in England, it sometimes happens that the man who by common consent is slated for the Cabinet is left out, and a man of whom no one has thought is put in, sometimes without much enthusiasm on the part of the President. But, broadly speaking, the President has liberty of action. In the old days the President's most formidable rival was tendered a portfolio, usually the Secretaryship of State as the place of highest honour, but that custom has now fallen into abeyance. It is the general belief that Mr. Bryan will be asked to join the Cabinet, not because he contested the nomination with Mr. Wilson, but because he occupies a peculiar position in the Democratic Party and has a larger personal following than any other Democrat.

A President may make his Cabinet in the true sense of the word his "advisers" or they may occupy the same relation that department managers do to the proprietor of a large manufacturing establishment; it all depends upon the temperament of the President. Mr. Roosevelt insisted upon knowing everything that was done and liked to be consulted even about minor matters; Mr. Taft announced at the beginning of his administration that he would hold his Secretaries responsible for the conduct of their departments and would leave details to them. The newspapers frequently use the expression the "policy of the Cabinet," but it has no meaning in the European sense. The Cabinet meets regularly twice a week, and at those meetings matters of importance, appointments, and policies are discussed, but any policy adopted is that of the President and not the Cabinet. It is the President who can veto the Cabinet, but not the Cabinet who can veto the President. A member of the Cabinet holds office at the pleasure of the President; if he displeases the President he can be dismissed; if he is dissatisfied with the policy of the President he can resign; but he cannot advocate a policy of his own, nor can he force a policy upon the President, unless the

President is too weak to assert himself; neither can he block the President by organising a cabal of his fellow members. On his Cabinet household the President sits at the head of the table and is supreme. Even a "policy" can be carried out only as Congress permits it. Within the scope of the law the head of the department may act, but Congress can at any time repeal the law or by resolution bind the hands of the Secretary.

A Cabinet may do a President a great deal of harm, but it is seldom able to do him very much good. At the close of the Spanish War, when it was discovered that the troops had been fed on rotten meat and the medical arrangements were inadequate, the public clamoured for a victim, and Mr. Alger, the Secretary of War, was made the scapegoat. Mr. Alger was not responsible for the country's unpreparedness for war; the real blame rested on Congress, which had refused to make the necessary appropriations or to provide for a modern military system, but dead or defeated members of Congress could not be crucified, while Mr. Alger could easily be brought to the place of execution. Mr. McKinley either had to stand by Mr. Alger because he knew he was unjustly accused and risk a loss of popularity, or throw over his Secretary of War as a concession to public opinion. This he did, and the public, having been given a victim, was satisfied and Mr. McKinley lost none of his popularity. Mr. Ballinger, Mr. Taft's Secretary of the Interior, was the target for the attacks of the men who were looking for an opportunity to injure the President, and a bitter campaign was carried on to drive Mr. Ballinger out of the Cabinet. Convinced of his Secretary's integrity, and his correct administration of his office, Mr. Taft refused to appease his enemies by dismissing Mr. Ballinger, and his retention of the Secretary undoubtedly was one of the causes to weaken his hold on the country. It is expected of the Cabinet that its members will be politicians and that they will help the President's political fortunes, especially when he is seeking renomination. Not being a politician himself, Mr. Taft selected as his Cabinet men whose chief claim to recognition was not political, and that was another of Mr. Taft's mistakes. Last summer Mr. Taft received almost no assistance from his Cabinet, few of whom took any active part in the campaign or were possessed of sufficient political knowledge to control their own States. If a member of

the Cabinet does something conspicuously good it is the President who gets the credit, if the member is a failure the President is blamed for having put him in the Cabinet.

A President almost always has two cabinets—the official, consisting of the heads of the great executive departments, and his "kitchen cabinet." The term originated in derision when President Jackson took his Cabinet very little into his confidence and turned for advice to a few intimates who were not in the Government. Since then the men who are close to the President are known as the "kitchen cabinet"—in the Roosevelt Administration the name was changed to the "tennis cabinet," as most of its members played tennis with him on the White House grounds—and they are frequently a great deal more powerful than the Cabinet proper. The members of the kitchen cabinet may be senators or departmental subordinates or men not in official life, but they are always known, and they reveal more intimately the character of the President than his official Cabinet, for a man is known by his friends. The premier of Mr. McKinley's kitchen cabinet was Senator Mark Hanna, to whom McKinley was largely indebted for his election. Mr. Roosevelt's cronies were mostly young men—Mr. Garfield, afterwards Secretary of the Interior, was one of them, and Mr. Pinchot was another, with whom he played tennis and rode and took long walks and whose outlook on life was similar to his own; but he was catholic in his tastes and the circle was always changing. Mr. Taft has had many friends but few intimates, and the kitchen cabinet has not been commissioned during his administration. The public is now speculating whether Mr. Wilson will revive the ancient institution after the fourth of next month or, like Mr. Taft, be content with his official Cabinet.

• •

The adoption by a sufficient number of the States of the amendment to the Constitution granting to Congress the power to levy an income-tax is one of the most important things that has happened in our generation in American politics. It is the first time in forty-three years that the Constitution has been amended, and only the third time since its adoption. Almost immediately following the adoption of the Constitution it was

amended, but those amendments were really an integral part of it. Following the Civil War, with the abolition of slavery, the Constitution had to be amended to adapt it to changed conditions, and since then it has remained unaltered. In the intervening years changes were often discussed but never seriously attempted, because it came to be believed that only a foreign or civil war or a crisis so great that threatened the very life of the nation could overcome the inertia necessary to bring about amendment. The Constitution cannot be lightly altered. There are two methods provided. One is for a resolution to be proposed in Congress, and if it receives the support of two-thirds of both Houses and three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States the amendment is adopted, or two-thirds of the legislatures of all the States may demand that a convention be called, and if three-fourths of the legislatures ratify the amendments proposed by the convention they become effective. This, it will be seen, is cumbersome, slow, and affords ample opportunity for politicians to prevent action, and for more than forty years the organic law remained practically in its original form.

There has long been an agitation for an income-tax. It took concrete form under the last Democratic President, when an income-tax was made a part of the Tariff Bill of 1894, but the Supreme Court held it to be unconstitutional because it violated that provision of the Constitution which prohibits the imposition of a "direct tax" unless it shall be apportioned among the States in proportion to population. In the face of that decision nothing could be done unless the Constitution was amended, and that, as I have already said, most persons regarded as impossible. Mr. Taft met the situation in a way by coming to the conclusion that while an income-tax was unconstitutional the Federal government had the power to impose an "excise tax" as a payment for the privilege of conducting business, and on his recommendation Congress passed the "corporation-tax" law, which in effect is an income-tax paid by certain joint-stock companies but not by individuals. This, however, was only a step, and to meet the objections of the Supreme Court Mr. Taft also recommended that a constitutional amendment be proposed to give the Government the power "to lay and collect taxes on income from whatever source derived."

The adoption of this amendment marks the beginning of a new era in American taxation. Heretofore the Government derived its revenue from tariff duties and inland revenue taxes, and since the passage of the corporation-tax law about £6,000,000 were returned from that source annually. The income-tax, levied on all incomes in excess of £1000, is estimated to produce about £20,000,000 a year, which will be very welcome to the Treasury, as expenditures are increasing faster than revenues, and with the additions to the free list contemplated by the Democratic Tariff Bill it will be more than ever necessary to take means to meet the deficit. In America, as in England, the demands of "social justice" are constantly becoming greater and wealth has to bear a heavier burden. The tendency of the age is to compel the distribution of wealth among the less favoured and the poor by means of taxation which falls heaviest upon the rich, and an income-tax must pay pensions and provide for other forms of social legislation. The United States has long resisted this tendency, but at last it has had to yield to the spirit of the times. The adoption of this amendment is also noteworthy as showing that it is possible to amend the Constitution, which need not clog progress because it must be held sacred. With some Americans the Constitution is a fetish, and they regard any proposal to modify it to suit modern conditions as a profanation. With due deference to the wisdom of the men who made it, the Constitution was the work of human hands, and no more sanctity should attach to it than any other man-made work. It is safe to say that constitutional amendments will not be feared so much in the future, and it is worth noting that at the present time there is another constitutional amendment pending to elect Senators by the direct vote of the people instead of by the legislatures; and the Senate only a few days ago adopted a resolution to submit to the legislatures a constitutional amendment to extend the term of the President from four to six years but to make him ineligible for re-election. As the House has not yet acted upon the resolution, it will be some time before the legislatures are required to vote.

This last proposed amendment—to limit the term of the President to six years—would mean a long step forward in putting

American politics on a higher plane and giving greater dignity to the American Presidency. At the present time the President is elected for four years and by custom may be a candidate for re-election, so that the presidential term is really not four but eight years. Every President looks forward to a re-election, and naturally so; few Presidents have voluntarily relinquished the Presidency, and the refusal of his party to renominate him or of the people to re-elect him is a bitter humiliation—it is the party or popular verdict of contempt or incapacity. No matter how exalted a President's ideals, his course of conduct is coloured by the desire to be renominated, which makes him more a politician than is good either for himself or the country. Senator Root put this very plainly when he said in the Senate, supporting the resolution:

> I think the possibility of renomination and re-election of a President who is in office seriously interferes with the working of our governmental machinery during the last two years of his term; and just about the time he gets to the point of highest efficiency people in the Senate and in the House begin to figure to try to beat him. You cannot separate the attempt to beat an individual from the attempt to make ineffective the operations of the government which that individual is carrying on in accordance with his duty. Legislation in this Congress has been largely dominated for two years past by considerations of that sort; and I should like to see those considerations exiled from these halls.
>
> The work of the executive departments is affected by a situation of this kind. The heads of bureaux and the heads of divisions and the clerks and the subordinate officers begin toward the end of a term to turn their attention to the question of election or re-election, and their efficiency is greatly decreased.
>
> I think we would have a more effective Government if we exiled from the considerations operating upon both legislation and administration any idea of re-election of the President. It is for that reason that I have felt very favourably inclined toward this amendment.

The amendment meets with opposition on variuos grounds. Mr. Wilson's friends naturally think that he is entitled to the customary eight years, and the adoption of the amendment would deprive him of a quarter of the normal term. Some of Mr. Taft's friends believe he may again be the Republican candidate, but the amendment would bar him. Mr. Roosevelt's ardent supporters have not abandoned the hope of having him once more lead them, and they say the proposed amendment is directed against him and is an effort to defeat the will of the people. A still further objection, and one that has sufficient merit to make some

people question the wisdom of the adoption of the amendment, is that if the President is elected for six years it might be possible for Congress to block legislation for four years of his term. A member of the House is elected for two years, and it often happens that at the mid-term congressional election a majority is returned in opposition to the President, which was the case two years ago. Since then legislation recommended by the President has been ignored by the House, tariff Bills passed by a Democratic-Radical-Republican coalition have been vetoed by the President. If the President's term was extended to six years that of members of the House might be lengthened to four, but this would be foreign to the American theory of keeping the House in close touch with the people by means of frequent elections. Nothing is more fatal to efficiency than these continual elections, but Americans believe it is a check exercised upon their representatives and will not lightly surrender it. In fact, the present demand is to make the tenure of office still more insecure by the people being given the power through the "recall" to vote an elective officer out of office at any time when he displeases them. This on the theory that insecurity is the surest way to keep a man honest and responsive to the voice of the people.

New York is in one of its regularly recurring moods of despair and self-contempt and house-top proclaiming of its own corruption and the villainy of every one else. For the fourth or fifth time in recent years the public has been told of the dishonesty and demoralisation of the New York police force and the partnership that exists between the police and crime. It is such an old story that it should not surprise any one, but the New York newspapers are apparently as amazed as if they heard it for the first time and had never suspected that their police are the instigators and abettors of crime instead of preventing it, or that the criminal classes have not been the chief source of revenue of the police, acting for themselves and the politicians who are their masters.

The disclosures began with the murder of the gambler Rosenthal last summer, which was brought home directly to the police department. Becker, a police lieutenant, in command of a squad of men to break up gambling, was charged with having engaged

a gang of gunmen to murder Rosenthal so as to prevent his disclosures. Becker and the gunmen have since been convicted of murder and are now under sentence of death, but that does not necessarily mean they will be executed, as the American Courts are always jealous of the "rights" of the convicted and go out of their way to find reasons why new trials should be granted on flimsy technicalities. But the convictions convinced the public of the truth of the charges made by Rosenthal and other gamblers that they were the victims of the police, that the police permitted gambling to exist for their own profit, and that gamblers, dissolute women, and other traffickers in vice were unmolested so long as they paid for immunity. Since then a committee of the Board of Aldermen has been investigating the police department, and the revelations are astounding. In New York vice is a business, and an extremely lucrative enterprise—that is, for the police. Gamblers had to take risks, the police took their pay in advance, and unless the "protection money" was paid every week the gambling-houses were closed. Street-walkers and brothel-keepers went undisturbed when they paid; burglars, pickpockets, and highwaymen could pursue their gentle vocations without anxiety so long as they divided their earnings with New York's guardians of law.

But amazing as these revelations are—or rather, as they would be to an Englishman who has a respect for the police and the Courts and is unfamiliar with the ways of New York—they are only an old story to the American whose memory runs back a few years. Every few years there is an investigation of the police department of New York, and the story is always the same. There is always the same partnership between the police and crime, there is always the same evidence of policemen and other officials on small salaries becoming the owners of expensive houses and other property; some of them have owned yachts and fast horses. Some years ago, when the police were under investigation, a captain, testifying under oath, was asked to explain how he had made his money. He flippantly replied that he had "speculated in corner-lots in Japan," and the investigators were satisfied with that answer. Investigations are usually a farce. While they are in progress the public is indignant and the newspapers demand reform, but after the evidence has been taken and a minor official

or two dismissed in the name of reform the public again becomes indifferent, and the police once more engage in their congenial occupation of speculating in corner-lots in Japan, until an extraordinarily brutal crime or some other similar occurrence arouses New York from its lethargy long enough for an investigation to be ordered and then to be quickly forgotten.

Dividing attention with the police disclosures is the agitation over the building of the New York Underground Railway—or the subway, as it is called. Under franchises granted by the city these subways are to be built by private enterprise, but the interest on the capital represented is guaranteed by the city, and the arrangement the municipal authorities has sanctioned has been savagely attacked by some of the newspapers on the ground that the banking syndicate which supplies the capital will make excessive profits. Mr. Hearst's delectable *Journal* had a page leader the other day, the tone of which can be gathered from this title: "You Money Men, Trust Owners! Do You Want to Force the People to Confiscation? If You Steal Their Property, Why Should They Not Confiscate Yours? That Will Come—and Soon—if You Are Not Careful." The article is extremely violent, it is an incitement to disorder, and in varying forms this language is used: "The people outnumber you. They would sweep you and your judges and your criminal lawyers into jail or off the earth in a minute if once aroused, and they would take in the name of justice that which you call yours, that which you have stolen from the public."

The owners of property are repeatedly threatened with confiscation, there is the usual reference to the French Revolution, the people are warned that when the revolution comes "the good may suffer with the bad" and the public will be in a mood "to listen to violent men." In a word, the whole article is an appeal to lawlessness and mob violence because the *Journal* disapproves of the subway contracts, and believes, or at any rate affects to believe, that the rights of the people—and Mr. Hearst has consecrated himself to be the guardian of the rights of the people—are not properly protected.

It is easy enough to term Mr. Hearst's lucubrations as sensation mongering, but they cannot be so lightly dismissed. Mr.

Hearst's newspapers—and he conducts them in half a dozen widely distributed cities—have very large circulations, and the people who buy them are those most easily influenced by what they read. They cannot be incited to violence and encouraged to lawlessness without some at least yielding to the suggestion. One need not be an alarmist or attach undue importance to reckless words and speech not to recognise the danger that may follow, and there are to-day in the United States well-balanced and discriminating men who, in private conversation, do not hesitate to say that the future seriously disturbs them. I have been told by men in whose judgment confidence can be placed that they would not be surprised if there is a great industrial panic or a social revolution in this country before many years, and the fact that men of character talk in this fashion must be regarded as significant. Socialism is on the increase and agitation goes on unabated. Capital is the target for every stump orator. In New York recently Joseph Ettor, who escaped conviction of having incited the mill strikers at Lawrence to commit murder, urged the striking hotel waiters to put poison in the food of hotel guests so long as the hotel proprietors refused to concede the demands of the strikers, but Ettor goes unpunished, and he is allowed to counsel murder because the right of "free speech" may not be infringed. Newspapers may preach revolution because a "free" press is one of the heritages of liberty. Passion may be inflamed because the United States is a "free" country. The rights and liberties of the individual apparently count for nothing as against the passion of the mob. It only needs a little more encouragement for the mob to break out of bounds.

A. MAURICE LOW.

MR. CHURCHILL AND THE NAVY

THE present Government have sufficiently demonstrated their appreciation of the position of the Royal Navy, its office and traditions, in the national life, by the persons whom they have appointed to the high and honourable post of First Lord of the Admiralty. It has been occupied within living memory by such men as Lord George Hamilton, Lord Spencer, Lord Goschen, Lord Selborne, Lord Cawdor. Under the present Administration they were succeeded by Lord Tweedmouth, with regard to whose tenure of office silence is appropriate. Mr. McKenna's term at the Admiralty was notorious, being distinguished by a state of things in the Navy which has no parallel for a hundred years—to go no further back. It cannot be said that he was about to resign when he was transferred to the Home Office because, to adapt a phrase of Matthew Arnold, every one of his Majesty's Ministers has a passionate, almost bloodthirsty, clinging to office; but he ought to have resigned several times over. He was succeeded by Mr. Winston Churchill, who may perhaps be described without offence as the wild-cat stock of the speculative politician. He came from the Home Office, in which Department he was the prisoner's friend. His administration had been justly censured by the Unionist Press; indeed, his whole record, in other times, would have disqualified him from any further employment in the service of the State. But not at all. Mr. Churchill's appointment to the Admiralty was hailed with an extraordinary outburst of enthusiasm on the part of a section of the Unionist Press, which was apparently inspired by the singular belief that Mr. Churchill could or would change his character as easily as his political opinions.

The excuse solemnly offered by Mr. Churchill's Unionist apologists was that the Navy should be "kept above party."

Their notion of fulfilling that amiable aspiration was, and is, to support Mr. Churchill, right or wrong. It is not, however, a question of party. It is a question of fitness for the post. But, in truth, the whole contention is so absurd that it is not worth arguing. During the last six years the interests of both Services have been shamelessly sacrificed to the interests of the Radical Party while Unionists have stood by with scarce a word of protest, because, according to themselves, they might be accused of party spirit if they exposed the truth and did their duty by their constituents and the country. A part of the Unionist Press has gone further, by covering up awkward facts and by actually expressing approval of Mr. Churchill's administration. The real explanation of what appears to be merely mental aberration is probably to be found in the great Fisher Cabal. Let no one suppose that when Lord Fisher retired, his influence waned. On the contrary, the Fisher Cabal is still flourishing, and Mr. Churchill is part of it. So powerful is the intrigue that it was not long ago that mysterious proposals to constitute Mr. Churchill permanent First Lord, irrespective of a change of Government, were seriously discussed in the Unionist party. And then Unionists are surprised that the country does not believe in them!

When Mr. Churchill succeeded to the chaos bequeathed by Mr. McKenna, the situation foretold two years previously by serious students of affairs had arisen. The naval supremacy of Great Britain was slipping away so rapidly that there was no more than a last chance of restoring it ere it was too late. What use Mr. Churchill made of his opportunity shall be set forth.

He began by giving a week's notice to the First Sea Lord, Admiral of the Fleet Sir Arthur Wilson, a distinguished veteran who was trusted by the whole Service, and who had been placed at the Admiralty by the express desire of the late King Edward. Mr. Churchill subsequently stated that the retirement of the Admiral was anticipated by only a few weeks. That statement was inaccurate. It was anticipated by three months, and was effected with an unusual disregard of courtesy. Admiral Sir Francis Bridgeman succeeded Sir Arthur Wilson. What happened to Sir Francis will be related in its place.

Mr. Churchill at once instituted a War Staff at the Admiralty, a reform whose adoption had been urged by all those who understood war for thirty years, a reform to promote which the Navy League had been originally founded, and the necessity for which had been constantly preached by Professor Spenser Wilkinson and by every other serious student of war. The new body, however, was to be merely "advisory." It has no executive power. It was tacked on to a Board of Admiralty whose system of organisation of business effectually prevents organisation for war, and which was further weakened by an increased usurpation of sailors' duties by civilians. The office of Comptroller, hitherto exercised by the Third Sea Lord, was abolished, and a part of its duties were confided to an additional member of the Board, a civilian. Briefly, the object of the change was to confer the final decision in certain matters involving large expenditure to a civilian ignorant of naval requirements. The Sea Lords might have declined to permit the innovation, but they did not. Its full beauty will not be revealed until an emergency occurs.

In the meantime, the recent cases of the *Torch*, *Prometheus* and *Proserpine* cruisers, all of which were sent to sea in a dangerously unseaworthy condition, afford an instructive example of the working of the new system. Six officers have either been censured or superseded in connection with the *Torch* and *Prometheus*. But it has not yet been proved that these officers were not doing their best to carry into execution the instructions of the Admiralty. the Board and the Government are jointly responsible for risking the lives of officers and men. Mr. Churchill, interrogated upon the subject in the House, lost his temper as usual.

Mr. Churchill's next adventure was to redistribute and to rename the squadrons of the Fleet. It was the same Fleet; but it seems to be a part of the Fisher policy perpetually to change names, duties, and stations, driving officers and men to despair. The historic names of the various Fleets were abolished, and numbers were employed instead. The scheme was apparently a vague reminiscence of the system employed in the Army, of which Mr. Churchill was once a subaltern. It looked imposing on paper, it conveyed the impression of zeal, and it inspired new eulogies on the part of Mr. Churchill's claque.

Then came the Belfast interlude. It was not Mr. Churchill's business to meddle with Irish politics. To put the matter plainly, he is not paid to foment revolution in Ireland. The Minister of a great department has no right to play the violent party politician at one moment, and the next to pose as the patriotic statesman. That a First Lord of the Admiralty should have thrown aside his duties to court a public humiliation degrading to his office and derogatory to the Government, at the cost of several thousands of pounds to the ratepayer; that he should have been formally condemned by the Unionist Press on one day, when he was talking nonsense cheek by jowl with the enemies of England on a Nationalist platform; and that the next, he should be lauded by the same newspapers as a great naval administrator, a strong man, and all the rest of it—these are things which so sicken decent people that they loathe the very name of politics, and damn both parties with an equal scorn.

When he introduced the Navy Estimates in March 1912, Mr. Churchill spoke very bravely of the necessity for increasing the Navy, and promised supplementary estimates. The Unionist Party, as usual, meekly accepted the official view of the situation. They did not even effectively protest against the abandonment of the Mediterranean which was announced by Mr. Churchill as a mere matter of detail. But some weeks later, when, the Mediterranean having been deserted by British battleships at a time when a war was in progress in those waters, Lord Charles Beresford aroused the country by a series of vigorous letters; and the Government—not the Opposition—saw that it would not do, the Prime Minister, the First Lord, and the Second Sea Lord, voyaged to Malta in the Admiralty yacht—of course at the public expense—to confer with Lord Kitchener. In the result, it was announced that four battle-cruisers would be sent to the Mediterranean. They are not there yet.

The reason assigned by Mr. Churchill for abandoning the Mediterranean was that the ships were required in home waters. The dilemma is complete. If the ships are required at home, they ought not to be abroad. But if they are at home, then Great Britain has abandoned the strategic key-position of the world. Mr. Churchill, whose attainments in strategy must be

nearly as remarkable as Lord Haldane's proficiency in that science, stated that by basing a weak battle-squadron on Gibraltar it would serve either purpose. But it hardly requires a profound strategist to perceive that it must fail in both. In the meantime, only one battle-cruiser, the *Inflexible*, has been stationed in the Mediterranean, together with two armoured cruisers and three attached cruisers. Germany, of course, remarked—and continues to remark—with perfect truth that Great Britain has been driven out of the Mediterranean without a shot being fired.

In strict accordance with the Fisher policy, a great assembly of the Fleet was arranged during the summer for the purpose of allaying public uneasiness. It is a mistake to try the same trick too often. The truth cannot be hidden for ever; and it became common knowledge that in order to furnish crews for the manœuvres every available man was employed, including a part of the Reserve. A deficiency of 20,000 men is hard to conceal.

With regard to the manœuvres that followed the assembly, the Admiralty maintained a strict silence. Briefly, what happened was that the force detailed to defend the eastern coasts lost all trace of the attacking force, which had proceeded across the North Sea. It anchored on the other side in a safe place, and waited. In the meantime, the defenders steamed rapidly up and down the North Sea until their coal and oil were exhausted, when they went into harbour. The enemy then crossed the North Sea and held the eastern coasts at their mercy. *Absit omen.*

Mr. Churchill's conception of his office is that he is the Head of the Royal Navy, a position which is, of course, occupied by his Majesty the King. The First Lord is not even Lord High Admiral, an office which is discharged by the Lords Commissioners of the Board of Admiralty acting in concert. Constitutionally, the First Lord represents the Government upon the Board, and he is responsible to the Cabinet for its actions. That is his position. But Mr. Churchill suffers under the delusion that he is Lord High Admiral of the Royal Navy. So profound is his ignorance of his constitutional position, or so cynically regardless of its limitations is he, that he has issued orders to the Fleet over his own signature. Such orders are technically void. The Board of Admiralty ought, of course, to have resigned in a body upon the first offence. On one occasion, the Fleet received

orders to alter its arrangements apparently in order that the First Lord might witness some tactical exercises before catching his train. The victualling arrangements were upset, and eighty tons of beef and a hundred tons of bread were left to rot on shore by the Fleet, which had no time to take them on board. Is this economy or efficiency or both?

Another of Mr. Churchill's little idiosyncrasies is perpetually to issue new printed regulations to the officers of the Fleet, informing those gentlemen how to execute their duties. Here is a sample, quoted in the *Naval and Military Record* for January 29 last: "The officer of the division is to take an interest in his division. He is to advise them on all matters connected with the Service. . . . He is responsible that their messes are properly cleaned. . . . He should encourage them in all recreations and games. . . . He must know their names. . . ."

The reception of such admonitions—sufficiently defined in the homely proverb concerning elderly relatives and the method of dealing with eggs—is exemplified in some spirited verses contributed to the *Naval and Military Record*, as follows:

"Oh, tell me, young lieutenant,
I prithee tell me why
From morn to night you bear the light
Of madness in your eye;
Some reason for your haggard look
Please unto me supply"
I paused, and then in hollow tones
He made me this reply:

"I have a large Division,
Observe the little dears;
I wipe their noses for them,
And scrub their little ears;
I wash their rosy faces
Till each with soap has shone,
And mend their little trousers,
And sew their buttons on."

"But do you never learn," said I,
"The Navy's arts and crafts?"
"Oh, no," said he, "we've got to teach
Them dominoes or draughts;
We have no time for learning,
But no one seems to mind . . .
Now, George, give Willy back his top,
And don't be so unkind."

Thus has the fire kindled until our wardroom poet spake with his tongue. Officers' cabins are littered with the "new regulations." Officers seldom have the time to read them, being employed about their proper business. No officer ought to obey the new regulations—even if obedience to these extraordinary documents were possible—until he has ascertained if they agree with the King's Regulations. And no officer has either the time or the inclination to conduct such a research. The effect of this state of things upon discipline is merely disastrous. But not

content with these excursions, Mr. Churchill has altered the rules and penalties of discipline. The result is that discipline, as the word was understood a few years ago, no longer exists. There can be no graver responsibility than interference with discipline. No doubt the professional humanitarians can appeal to sentiment. The fact remains that injury which may be irreparable has been inflicted upon the vital nerve of the Service.

Under a united Board of Admiralty no such innovations would be permitted for an instant. But disunion and weakness have given the disturber his opportunity. Mr. Churchill took care first to perpetuate division in the Board and then to give it the force of an enactment. In September last he issued a statement on the business of the Department, published in the Press, which, with a few honourable exceptions, fulsomely praised the new scheme. *Its main principle is to separate the departments one from the other, while extending civilian control.*

The First Lord, for instance, takes the "general direction of all business," which covers everything. His action is illegal, for the Admiralty is a Board acting under its constitution as a whole. The First Lord also reserves appointments to himself—another illegality. "Each Member of the Board and the Parliamentary and Permanent Secretaries will communicate direct with the First Lord": this provision ensures individual instead of collective action. The Board, in fact, ceases to exist, as such. The First Sea Lord alone is charged "with preparation for war." But he can only "advise." Whom is he to "advise"? The First Lord? And with whom rests the decision? The Second, Third, and Fourth Sea Lords are restricted to their own departments, which are, briefly, personnel, material, and transport respectively.

Now, there can be no preparation for war unless the heads of all departments concerned act collectively and in concert, with a single object in view. As reconstituted by Mr. Churchill, the Admiralty can do everything but prepare for war. If by any chance war were to break out, the whole system would break down inside a week. When this country was continually at war, the Board acted collectively and in concert and were solely occupied with preparation for war and its conduct. The

supply departments were managed by the Navy Board. That department was corrupt and wasteful, and it was abolished. But the principle of separating preparation for war from supply was sound; it is, indeed, the only sound principle. The principle of Mr. Churchill's scheme is to place the control of expenditure with the civilian element at the Admiralty, for political purposes.

When Sir John (now Lord) Fisher became First Sea Lord, he obtained an Order in Council from the Unionist Government of the day, whose effect was to constitute him virtual dictator at the Admiralty, and dictator he remained. Successive First Lords were as clay in the hands of the potter. But when Mr. Churchill became First Lord, the dictator had retired; and had Mr. Churchill possessed even one of the virtues wildly ascribed to him by his friends in the Unionist Press he would have restored the Board to its rightful position. But he preferred to assume the dictatorship himself. Disunited and weakened as the Board was, Mr. Churchill nevertheless met with some righteous opposition on the part of one or two of its members. These, of course, have since been removed from the Board, upon one pretext or another.

There now falls to be related an action of Mr. Churchill for which he deserves all commendation, except one—the commendation of having the courage to stick to his point. He was desirous of raising the pay of the Service, which is, and remains, a national disgrace, and a permanent bar to recruiting. A new scheme was prepared, involving substantial increase. The Treasury rejected it, Mr. Lloyd George having a natural objection to paying anything to any one who has not a vote to give him in exchange. Here was Mr. Churchill's opportunity. Had he resigned, he would have obtained justice for the officers and men of the Fleet. He did not resign. He consented to prepare a modified scheme, and submitted it to the Treasury. The Treasury again refused to grant the money. Then the Sea Lords came to Mr. Churchill's help. They threatened resignation if the modified scheme were not accepted. It was accepted. It was entirely inadequate, and its effect upon both men and officers was to convince them that the Government were only playing with the question. Of course, the Unionist Press, with the usual exceptions, belauded Mr. Churchill's generosity, and announced—what was absolutely false—that the Fleet were delighted with his "Christmas-box." Men

do not want Christmas-boxes; they want proper pay. They have not got it. Officers and men are alleged to be leaving the Service.

The full truth concerning the retirement of Admiral Sir Francis Bridgeman from the post of First Sea Lord has not yet been divulged. In all probability, none of the facts would have been disclosed had it not been for a chance question asked in the House of Commons of the First Lord. Mr. Churchill had given it to be understood that Sir Francis had retired at his own request. Pressed by Lord Charles Beresford in the House of Commons, Mr. Churchill confessed that it was at his suggestion, and *not* at the suggestion of the First Sea Lord, that Sir Francis left the Admiralty. This remarkable admission naturally awakened suspicion. During the debate on the subject which took place on December 20, further interesting admissions were dragged from Mr. Churchill. It appeared that before writing to Sir Francis Bridgeman (who was on leave at the time) with reference to his resignation, Mr. Churchill had "consulted the Prime Minister and informed the King." What his Majesty was told is not explained. Was the King told that Sir Francis Bridgeman wished to retire? If so . . . It is clear, however, that Mr. Churchill arranged the whole matter behind the back of Sir Francis Bridgeman. He then wrote to the First Sea Lord, hinting that if Sir Francis felt the strain of his work to be too heavy, Mr. Churchill would accept his resignation. The Admiral replied that he was perfectly well and that he was about to return to the Admiralty. But before he received this reply, Mr. Churchill had written again to Sir Francis, bluntly informing him that his removal had been already settled. It was this letter which Mr. Bonar Law described as "brutal treatment" of the Admiral. Sir Francis returned a dignified reply, complying with the First Lord's request.

So far, Mr. Churchill stood convicted of having attempted, by implication, to mislead the House of Commons and of having dealt "brutally" with an old and an honoured naval officer, occupying the highest position in the Service. Sir Francis Bridgeman had been appointed First Sea Lord a little more than a year previously, for three years. Mr. Churchill himself bore witness to his zeal and capacity. What was Mr. Churchill's defence?

He began by savagely attacking the members of the Opposition who had raised the question. Mr. Churchill's invective was premeditated. He read it from a manuscript. A great Parliamentarian once observed of a political opponent that he drew upon his imagination for his facts and relied upon his memory for his wit. Mr. Churchill, by dint of long practice, can still exercise the first method; but his memory seems to have failed him. Of course the Unionist Party ought to have stopped Mr. Churchill; but, of course, they sat silent. It was left to Mr. Bonar Law alone to deal with the First Lord.

Mr. Churchill went on to assert that the retirement of Sir Francis Bridgeman "was due to reasons of health, and of health alone." In contravention of that statement there is the evidence of Sir Francis himself, supported by the diagnosis of his medical adviser, contained in the Admiral's letter of December 3, 1912, read by Mr. Churchill to the House. Mr. Churchill, however, knew better than Sir Francis and his doctor. The strength of his position lay in his constitutional right to dismiss any member of the Board, should the public interest require such action. Its fatal weakness appeared when, after attempting to mislead the House, Mr. Churchill actually produced and read before the House of Commons two private letters written by Sir Francis Bridgeman to his colleagues at the Admiralty. Such a violation of confidence is unpardonable. Henceforth every officer in the Service knows that his honour is no longer safe in the keeping of authority.

Mr. Churchill also asserted that he "did not remember" being "threatened with the resignation" of Sir Francis Bridgeman "at any time." The next day, an authoritative statement appeared in the *Morning Post* affirming that such a difference of opinion upon an important matter of naval administration, involving the threat of resignation on the part of Sir Francis Bridgeman, did occur. That statement is in accordance with the definite statement made both by Lord Charles Beresford and Mr. Fitzroy.

The student must draw his own conclusions. He may also profitably consider another statement made by Mr. Churchill, in which he said that, owing to "the conditions which prevailed," an "excessive strain" was thrown upon himself and the Second Sea Lord, H.S.H. Prince Louis of Battenberg. The spectacle of Mr. Churchill performing the duties of the First Sea Lord would

indeed have been edifying, if he had ever tried to do any such thing, which of course he had not. Thus did Mr. Churchill deliberately cast a slur upon Sir Francis Bridgeman, who, as Mr. Churchill was well aware, was not in a position to defend himself against such cowardly aspersions. Needless to remark, the whole disgraceful episode was glossed over by many Unionist newspapers, with the exceptions before noted.

Such are some of the aspects of Mr. Churchill's administration of the Royal Navy. What has he done with regard to the material of the Fleet? He brought in supplementary estimates last year; but as the amount was rather less than the sum voted but not expended during the previous year, these may be ignored. Their introduction, however, afforded Mr. Churchill the opportunity of making one of the most remarkable statements ever presented by a First Lord. Briefly, it was to the effect that in 1914 the Imperial German Navy would be superior in Home waters to the British Navy. That is precisely the situation which was foretold by authorities on the subject in 1909.

Next year, then, Germany, under the terms of the 1912 amendment to the Navy Law, will have 25 battleships, together with 4 nominally reserve battleships, 29 in all, in full commission; 8 large armoured cruisers; 18 small cruisers; 99 destroyers, and some 54 submarines, not to mention air-craft. According to Mr. Churchill, this country will have at the same date, 33 battleships in full commission. But that estimate assumes that there are no battleships at Gibraltar or in the Mediterranean. In other words, if the Mediterranean station is virtually abandoned, we can oppose 33 heavy ships to the 29 of Germany. The estimate assumes that all the ships on both sides are available; but the normal proportion of British ships under repair is 25 per cent. at least. Therefore, at what Mr. Churchill called our "average moment" as compared with the "selected moment" of Germany, the British force will be actually inferior.

Speaking at Dundee on January 30 last, Mr. Churchill said that "the Navy is not only strong, but is getting stronger, actually and relatively, and that there is no danger whatever to the great position we have acquired." This is the kind of remark whose audacity stupefies the mere student of facts. Mr. Churchill knows very well that the public do not study facts, and that—as

yet—they cannot bring themselves to believe that a Minister would thus behave. Woe to the credulous!

But if next year we are to become a second-class naval Power, what of this year? Mr. Churchill's own figures (which happen to be correct, with one exception) supply the information.

In 1905 there were 12 battleships in Home waters and 7 in the Atlantic, total 19. There were also 8 battleships in the Mediterranean and 5 on the China Station—32 all told. Germany then had 16 battleships in all, of which 3 were of very little value, and 4 more were greatly inferior to British ships. What is the position at this moment? Germany has 20 battleships in full commission in Home waters, not including 2 older ships. Great Britain has 28, if the 5 ships allocated (but not on the station) to Gibraltar be included. There is, therefore, a superiority over Germany of 8 ships, if the Mediterranean be deprived of battleships, and a certain quite indefinable superiority in material fighting power. With regard to battle-cruisers, Mr. Churchill omitted the three German ships. If the 4 battle-cruisers allocated (but not on the station) to Malta be deducted from the British total, there is equality in this type of vessel, 3 to 3 in Home waters.

So far as battleships are concerned, it comes to this: A margin of superiority over one naval Power alone can only be maintained by the abandonment of the Mediterranean, the main road to Egypt and to India and the route of £350,000,000 worth of trade. This, to quote Mr. Churchill, is "the great position we have acquired"; this it is, he says, to grow "stronger, actually and relatively."

An examination of the Navy List shows that we have several nucleus crew squadrons in reserve, and several squadrons in reserve having only skeleton crews. It is very doubtful, owing to the shortage of men, if the nucleus crew vessels could be completed to full complement. Even if they could be completed, they would not be fit for immediate action. The reserve ships can only be manned by Reserve men to come into action during the later stages of a war. The fact is, of course, that we have battleships enough to fulfil present requirements; but unfortunately these vessels happen to be empty. The Navy is 20,000 men short of present requirements. That is why the Admiralty are wholly unable to commission a separate fleet for the Mediterranean.

Mr. Churchill may lay down six battleships or sixty, this year or next year. He cannot man a single one of them unless he first puts an older ship out of commission. And what the better is the country for that? Two years to build a ship, six years to train a seaman—that is the formula. If we enjoy peace for another six years—well. If not——?

It is not Mr. Churchill's fault, but the fault of his predecessors, that the Navy is short of men. That he suppressed the truth in this matter is his fault. No fine speeches, no blustering about Germany, no wild talk about "selected moments" and "average moments," no counting ships nor juggling with statistics, will avail. Next year, if not before, any emergency might endanger the position of this country. In the meantime we are living largely on sufferance. Mr. Churchill had his chance, like other men. Being what he is, of course he threw it away. No intelligent person ever supposed for an instant that he would do anything else.

But it might not unreasonably have been supposed that nothing could be worse than the state of the Admiralty and the administration of the Navy under Mr. McKenna, and that any change must be an improvement. Mr. Churchill, however, has succeeded in demonstrating that an office of the Crown can be yet further degraded, that confusion may be worse confounded, and that it is possible for a Government to announce the necessity for abandoning the Mediterranean to an acquiescent Opposition, and to declare the virtual equality of the Fleet of one foreign Power alone to the effective British Fleet, amid the plaudits of the Press.

DREADNOUGHT.

THE NATIONAL INSURANCE ACT IN OPERATION

It was said by Mr. Lloyd George when he introduced the National Insurance Bill that the subject had been studied for two years, and that the Government had come to the conclusion, after considering all the alternatives, that a compulsory system applying to all employed people except those earning over £160 a year other than by manual labour was the only system which would successfully bring into insurance enough people to justify the claim that the nation would be insured. In May 1911, when the Bill was introduced, there was no one in the House of Commons who could claim to be so completely master of this complicated subject as to be able to controvert with confidence the necessity for compulsion. The arrangement of the debate also prevented the initial want of knowledge being made good. The actuaries' report containing the estimates of population and the numbers likely to be insured, as well as the financial basis of the scheme, was only published one day before the second reading, and the Committee stage was so fully occupied in discussing details and removing obvious absurdities that the main question of the choice between a compulsory scheme and a voluntary scheme received scant attention. Mr. Lloyd George, however, after two years' study, and with the assistance of all the experts at his disposal, ought to have been able to foresee, and ought to have warned the nation, that there were other consequences from compulsion than those he dwelt upon. The case for compulsion rested upon the estimate of the numbers who would be benefited compared with those who might be expected to benefit by a voluntary scheme.

Mr. Lloyd George did not give sufficient weight to the fact that besides those insured in Friendly Societies and Trade Unions

many more were insured in small Village Clubs and in Works Funds, and many others were protected already by the terms of their employment against loss of wages during short periods of sickness. Compulsion was applied to all alike—to the already insured, to the partly protected, and to the uninsured—no real endeavour being made to make the system sufficiently elastic to meet the varying requirements of the large population called upon for the first time to surrender their individual liberty. For those already insured voluntarily it is clear that a voluntary scheme with contributions from employer and the taxpayers would have sufficed. The position of the old voluntary Friendly Societies could have been strengthened without their being absorbed into a State machine.

A voluntary scheme at no greater cost than the present scheme could have been made so attractive that every one really capable of being insured would have been given every inducement to join, and we doubt whether in the long run it would have been found that many fewer people availed themselves of its advantages voluntarily than those now brought in by compulsion. The class of persons included would have been somewhat different. For example, the small employer and the worker on his own account could, by a voluntary scheme, have been given the same advantages as the employed person earning the same money. Why not? Is he not as good a citizen? Is not his need for insurance even greater? for he has no employer to assist him; but under the Government scheme on the average he has to pay double contributions, and in consequence certainly less than 100,000, possibly not more than 25,000, have become insured as against the 829,000 of Mr. Lloyd George's estimate. The compulsory system has, however, forced into insurance, or, rather, has forced to contribute, certainly a million persons who are unlikely to obtain any real insurance benefits. Of these several hundred thousands at least will contribute whenever they obtain employment, and their contributions will be eaten up in expenses. It is impossible to give exact figures, as even now the stamped cards for the quarter ended October 15, 1912, have not been counted and classified, and the real hardship will not be apparent to the public until the first four quarters have elapsed.

This year of good trade and improved employment will not

reveal what may be expected in average years; moreover, arrears do not count in the first year of insurance, and for both these reasons lapses will not occur for some time, so that evidence of the full cruelty of compulsion will be postponed. The difficulties have not yet been met. The deposit contributors get no insurance although they are forced to contribute. Their case is to be considered at a later date.

The outworkers have already been the subject of two Government enquiries, but it remains to be seen whether the effect of the Act upon them will not merely be that their employment is reduced, that they are forced to contribute when employed, and that their contributions are insufficient to secure them any tangible benefits. Workers in Government employ, clerks, and domestic servants have found already that they are now called upon to pay for some of the advantages which were theirs by right of their employment. Employers are naturally passing on the tax by adding it whenever they can to the price of the articles they manufacture or sell, and all the insured persons are finding that in one form or another the 4d. they pay is not really 4d.; it is something more, and many are wondering whether the 9d. they were told they would receive is really 9d. or something less. When we consider the administration which Mr. Lloyd George boasts is working so smoothly, we find that the difficulties largely due to the compulsory system have not yet been overcome.

He boasts that millions of stamps have been sold, but it is quite easy to sell stamps, if you threaten those who refuse to buy them with penalties of £10. The test is not the sale of stamps, but the receipt of benefits. Four of the benefits under the Act are in operation. The maternity benefit is the simplest—30s. on birth of a child. Elaborate regulations have been made with the very proper object of seeing that this benefit is used to secure attendance by a doctor or a midwife on the woman and the child—but these regulations are not being observed. The simple method is being adopted in paying out the 30s. in cash to the man and leaving everything else to chance. The position of the various Nursing Societies and the Maternity Hospitals has still to be reconciled with the Act.

The medical benefit, upon the success of which depends the health of the nation and the solvency of the various Approved

Societies, is in a chaotic condition. Some of the doctors who have hitherto treated the wage-earning classes have gone on the panels under compulsion, and have much of their time taken up in clerks' work, and others are risking ruin rather than submit to what, rightly or wrongly, they consider degrading conditions of service. A State medical service has been set up in a few districts, strangers having been sent down to do the work. The insured have in many districts been forced to change their doctors, having been deprived of the right to choose their doctor which was supposed to be secured them by the Act.

How odd it seems now that we ever believed Mr. Lloyd George's description of medical benefit: "What a fine thing it is to get the doctor you want and get some one else to pay for him! That is in the Government Insurance Bill." Members of the old Friendly Societies have had all their arrangements with doctors upset, and now either have to go without or pay a much higher annual charge. Deaths of doctors from overwork, and of patients from being unable to get a doctor, have already been reported. Hospital practice has been disturbed and the future of the hospitals is altogether uncertain. The sanatorium benefit has proved very different from the promises held out. Not a single one of the promised First-Class Hotels has yet been built. Beds have been provided in isolation wards of infectious hospitals, and the patients are liable to be turned out at a moment's notice. Schemes prepared by some counties for dealing with insured and uninsured patients have been thrown out of gear by the Government suddenly diverting 6d. out of the 1s. 3d. provided for sanatorium benefit. No one denies that much good is being done in the treatment of tuberculosis, but in this, as in other branches of the administration, want of preparation is observable.

The sickness benefit is also now in operation for those who have paid twenty-six weekly contributions. Medical certificates are required before payment is allowed, and most of the Societies require certificates from panel doctors; but the sick man's usual medical attendant may not be a panel doctor, he may be the doctor whom the club employed before the Act, and in such a case, though his certificate is accepted for the voluntary benefits apart from the Act, the patient has to be seen by a panel doctor

also before he can obtain sick pay under the Act. Could confusion be worse?

The administration of the Insurance Commissioners consists in making innumerable regulations and orders and issuing countless memoranda and forms, each requiring an expert draftsman to prepare them and a still greater expert to understand them. These regulations have the force of law; by the Act the people were supposed to be protected by a right being reserved to annul the regulations on petition to his Majesty, but the Government have taken the whole time of the House of Commons and have refused to give time for discussion of a motion to annul a regulation, and so this right has been lost. Meanwhile the Act is being altered and modified at will by the Commissioners without any check by the people or the people's representatives.

The Insurance Committees are supposed to be responsible for the county administration, especially of the medical and sanatorium benefits and of all benefits of the deposit contributors, but at present there is expensive and useless overlapping between these duties and the duties of the County Health Committees and the Poor Law authorities. The Insurance Committees are too large and most of the members have no experience in public work. The members are allowed travelling expenses and are asking also for remuneration for their time.

The Approved Society administration has yet to prove itself. The officials have had all their time taken up in issuing and collecting cards, in classifying their members, and in opening the books and studying and filling up forms. One thing is certain—that the allowance of 1s. 6d. a member per annum allowed to most of the secretaries is insufficient: the work involved as secretary of a Lodge of, say, 1000 members is whole-time work, and the remuneration is about £75 per annum. The secretary of such a Lodge must be a skilled accountant capable of understanding complicated regulations, with the patience of an angel and the hide of an ox. At and near the quarter-days he will probably have to engage and pay for assistance, although between-times he may be only partly occupied. If it had not been that the Government found at its hand insurance agents and secretaries of Friendly Societies, the local administration must have broken down entirely, and in many Societies it will break down. Too

much complicated work is being forced on people as yet unaccustomed to it. If the work is to be well done it will require whole-time service. If it is to be badly done it will mean insolvency for the Lodge or Society and further contributions exacted from members to make up the deficiencies.

I have touched only the fringe of the difficulties which ought to have been foreseen and provided for. Many of them need never have arisen if a subsidy had been given from contributions paid by employers and the State towards the cost of an approved system of voluntary insurance carried out by the Friendly Societies, Trade Unions, and Insurance Companies, and most of them would be removed if even now such a system were substituted.

L. Worthington Evans.

THE FIRST SOUTH AFRICAN CABINET

On May 31, 1910, when Union was proclaimed in South Africa, the Governor-General entrusted to General Botha the task of forming the first South African Cabinet. On December 16, 1912, the Governor-General, summoned in haste back to Pretoria from a visit to Kimberley, received and accepted the resignation of General Botha and asked him to undertake the reconstruction of his Cabinet. Thus the first South African Cabinet was formed and fell after a life of just over two and a half years. Its successor—for General Botha was successful in his second cabinet-making—is identical in *personnel* except for two changes. Sir Thomas Watt succeeds Colonel Leuchars as the representative of Natal in the Ministry. General Hertzog is no longer a member of the Botha Cabinet and no substitute has taken his place. The first change is not of great importance. Colonel Leuchars was as popular in Parliament as he is in his own Province, but he never even attempted to pose as a politician. A bluff soldier, essentially honest and outspoken, he looked, and was not reluctant to say that he felt, uncomfortable and out of place in the seat of a Minister of the Crown. Sir Thomas Watt will fill his place with a much readier power of self-adaptation to the demands of his position. The change itself, however, will not strengthen the Botha Cabinet in Natal. It would, indeed, be hardly too much to say that in that Province the credit gained for the Prime Minister by his expulsion of General Hertzog from the Cabinet will, to some extent at least, be forfeited by his choice of Sir Thomas Watt as the successor to Colonel Leuchars.

The second change is of infinitely greater importance. For, reviewing the political life of the first South African Cabinet, it is impossible to escape the fact that General Hertzog was its most forceful, as he was certainly its most verbose and outspoken,

member. That his influence should have been very strong was inevitable when the forces which procured for him his Ministerial position are remembered. At the time when General Botha was engaged in forming the first South African Cabinet these forces were known to exist. But they were kept in the background, obscured by that dim half-light with which the South African politician is so skilful to veil the motives of his actions. Now, with the expulsion of the ex-Minister of Justice from the Cabinet, these forces are revealed by his friends and supporters. At a meeting of protest against his expulsion held in Pretoria shortly after the resignation of the Prime Minister, General de Wet gave a perfectly frank exposition of them :

> He was proud [he said] to be there in the circumstances in which they were assembled, and he was happier on that dunghill (the speakers at the meeting actually spoke from the top of a dunghill), in the midst of his own people, than he would be on the most glittering platform among strangers. If ever there was a time when it behoved the Afrikander people to be calm and deliberate in their actions, that time was the present. He was not telling them to go home and rest content in the circumstances which had arisen ; that would be a poor part for Afrikanders to play. On the contrary, they must be resolute in their demand that General Hertzog should be restored to the position in which they had placed him. For he had not been placed in that position by the Ministry but by the people themselves. . . . General Hertzog, the fact remained, was the only man in the late Cabinet who had, through thick and thin, represented the people of the country, and he had been removed. He said that if they left General Hertzog in the lurch at the present time they would leave themselves in the lurch.*

It was thus as the special representative of the Dutch-speaking people of South Africa that General Hertzog joined the first Cabinet formed by General Botha under Union. He went into that Cabinet as the nominee of men like ex-President Steyn and General de Wet of the Free State, men of enormous influence among their people. He went in with the mantle of Kruger (so to speak) enfolding him. His task was to uphold the ideals and aspirations of the Afrikander people. He went in to carry on the work that Kruger had carried on before the war, the work that Kruger's successors (ex-President Steyn and General de Wet) were no longer prepared—the first through physical weakness, the second through soul-sickness of political life—to carry on. And, joining the first South African Cabinet in this way, he carried in that Cabinet not only the influence given him by his own

* Quoted from a report in the *Transvaal Leader*.

fanatical belief in the ideals of which he was the new exponent, but also the influence of the Kruger, the Steyn, the De Wet inheritance.

His colleagues had no such dominating and ruthless determination to give them strength and resolution. The Prime Minister himself, though he had been the generalissimo of the Boer forces during the war, and though he was known to be skilled in political leadership, gifted with the great gift of an attractive, tactful and at times impressive personality, had never stood out in the eyes of his own people as a convinced and stark upholder of the Boer tradition. Was he not always talking of "conciliation" and "union" between the two white races of South Africa; of "the hand of friendship" and of the "blood and tears" which had flowed as the result of racial strife? Had not the English king, too, made him a Privy Councillor? Had not the London crowd cheered him with suspicious enthusiasm? No. To the true Afrikander General Botha was suspect, even at the date of Union. The ardent followers of Hertzog thought that Botha was "Englishising." The same suspicion attached to his close fellow worker and friend General Smuts. The brain of the first Botha Cabinet; an enthusiast for work; widely read and broadly cultured, General Smuts might extort the admiration of his fellow countrymen, but he could never win their complete confidence. Those who have watched, since the Union Parliament first met, the career of "Jannie Smuts," have marvelled at the defects which handicap his remarkable ability. With an intellect that is like a surgeon's knife—so keen is it to pierce to the root of any legal intricacy; with a gift of orderly and at times brilliant verbal exposition; with an instinctive insight into the essentials of the sudden crises that spring up in any Parliamentary Party. he yet lacks the indefinable something which, if he had it, would place him easily first among the politicians of the Union. It would be brutal to define too bluntly the element which is lacking in that deep and inscrutable nature. But his best friends admit that General Smuts seems to have no respect for his own ability. Advocate by nature, he is attracted by the mere chance of advocacy. No case is so bad that he will refuse to attempt its defence; no argument so little plausible that he will despise its use; no distortion of fact so liable to immediate exposure that

he will not risk its employment for the sake of winning a momentary advantage. Your Boer has no prudish dislike of verbal subtleties. What he does dislike is that they should be palpably misleading subtleties, subject to ruinous exposure as soon as they are used. And the subtleties—to use no harsher word—of General Smuts have too often been of that ineffectual kind. On the other hand, the Parliamentary method of the other Transvaal member of the first South African Cabinet, if it was strongly in contrast with that of General Smuts, equally failed to win the complete confidence of the rank and file upon the Ministerial benches. Mr. Hull, first Minister of Finance for the Union, was abrupt and outspoken to a fault, over confident in his self-reliance, too little anxious to consult the varying susceptibilities of men who—joined for the first time in one Parliamentary Party—represented the interests of people living in all parts of the Union, interests often mutually conflicting. Such a failing was especially fatal to the Parliamentary success of a Minister for Finance. It led, at the end of the second session of the Union Parliament, to the sudden fall of Mr. Hull. Thrust from office by a quarrel with one of his colleagues (Mr. Sauer, veteran politician from the Cape and Minister of Railways for the Union), Mr. Hull was revealed as a politician without a following, carrying with him hardly the passing regrets of any member of his Party. His successful rival, Mr. Sauer, almost the equal in ability of General Smuts, far excelled him in knowledge of Parliamentary procedure and tactics, in debating readiness and felicity, and in the power of avoiding questionable arguments. From the very first day of the Union Parliament the influence of Mr. Sauer was strong in the Party which supported the Botha Cabinet. To his considerable gifts Mr. Sauer added an unrivalled Parliamentary experience. He was the old Parliamentary hand, his colleagues neophytes beside him. He had, too, the advantage of two factors which added greatly to his influence. First, he stood as the champion in the Cabinet of the interests of the Cape Province—the Province which had enjoyed years of self-government as a British Colony; the Province which boasted an established population, a settled prosperity, the glamour of old traditions hallowing the motherhood of the white races of South Africa. Second, he had as his ally Mr. Burton, perhaps the most efficient member of the Ministry,

less brilliant but more practically wise than General Smuts; hard, unsympathetic, unceasingly the lawyer; but always cool, always competent, never failing (as other Ministers were apt to do in those early days of Union) to rise to the most exacting demands of the occasion. Such were the characteristics of the most notable of the colleagues of General Hertzog in the first South African Ministry. The others can be dismissed, each in a phrase. Mr. Malan, formerly hailed as the successor of John Hofmeyr in the leadership of the Afrikander people, but deposed by his own ineptitude in favour of General Hertzog. Mr. Fischer, as venerable in intellect as in appearance. Colonel Leuchars, representative of Natal in the Cabinet and such as he has already been described. Sir David Graaff, reputed millionaire, the financial mainstay in politics of the Cabinet, but ineffectual in debate, almost a handicap in the House itself.

In this Cabinet of opportunists, of men whose political ideal rose no higher than successful manœuvring, General Hertzog stood out as the one man who had a grasp of the essentials of political strategy. This is not to say that his conception of political strategy involved any elaborate or complicated movements. It was a conception characteristic of his narrow and concentrated individuality; the strategy of the man of one idea; the plan almost of a monomaniac. The objective was clearly in sight, the path towards it was direct, the plan of action involved nothing more than a series of frontal attacks delivered one after another, with as little remission as possible, with a reckless disregard of the loss of life sustained, with an utter contempt of the opportunities for taking cover. Indeed the very form which the first South African Cabinet took was itself the visible sign that the first move in this plan of campaign had been made before the day of Union came. There is no need, at this distance of time, to revive the old controversy as to who was responsible for the formation of the first Union Ministry upon the lines which had divided political parties in the Cape, the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony before Union. Mr. Merriman, ex-Prime Minister of the Cape, cannot escape a share in this responsibility. Months before Union he indignantly rejected, for his part, the suggestion of the leader of South African Unionism, Dr. Jameson, that South Africa should follow the example of Canada and should

form her first Union Ministry on non-Party lines. But the decisive influence against this proposal was not the influence of Mr. Merriman. The man whose attitude was decisive in the judgment of General Botha—himself, if we are to believe his own professions, not averse from Dr. Jameson's idea—was General Hertzog. Not General Hertzog *in propria persona*, but General Hertzog as the nominee of ex-President Steyn and of General Christian de Wet, the inheritor of the Afrikander tradition, the wearer of the mantle of Kruger. With General Hertzog against him, and especially with General Hertzog against him as the representative of these forces in the eyes of the Afrikander people, General Botha determined that it would be political suicide for him to try to form a non-Party Ministry. Thus General Hertzog not only entered the first South African Cabinet as the apostle of the ideals of Afrikanderdom, but himself by the mere fact of that apostleship made the formation of the Cabinet from among the leaders of the Afrikander Party inevitable. It was the first step in the campaign, the opening move in the direct and simple strategic plan which he had laid down for himself. This is no idle assertion of an irresponsible critic. At the first congress of the South African National Party after Union, a congress presided over by General Botha as the Parliamentary leader of the Party ex-President Steyn made a speech in which he explained the reasons for his having refused to entertain the suggestion for a non-Party administration during the first years of Union. He had, he said, been against a coalition Ministry because, in his opinion, it would have been nothing but a compromise with their principles. Yet ex-President Steyn, General de Wet and General Hertzog had all been members of the South African National Convention. They had agreed to the draft Act of Union which laid down the principles to be followed in the government of United South Africa. That Act was supposed to embody the sacrifices which had been made by the leaders of both the English-speaking and the Dutch-speaking peoples of South Africa as the only possible basis of Union. Nothing can be more clear than the fact that if both sides had been honestly prepared to co-operate in the work of giving effect to the compromise embodied in the Union Act, a non-Party Government would have been not only the best but the only possible means for doing so. The refusal

of General Hertzog to give his support to a non-Party Ministry, coupled with the justification offered by ex-President Steyn for this refusal, shows conclusively that those whom General Hertzog represented desired to use the power which Union had put into their hands for the forwarding of their own ideals and principles. It was the first step in the Afrikander plan of campaign and General Botha was not strong enough at that time to resist it.

The nature of these ideals, the meaning of these principles, is to be seen when the record of the first South African Ministry is examined. Those who are intimate with the work of the South African Parliament during the two years of the tenure of office of the first Union Ministry will not deny that the business which really aroused the interest of the Ministry was that which raised the question of giving practical expression in the life of the country to these ideals and principles. It might have been expected that, in the first session of the Parliament of a country newly united, the energies of the legislature would have been concentrated on the work of adjustment and consolidation and administrative co-ordination which the Union itself had made imperative. Contentious topics, it might have been thought, would have been severely left alone. It was not so. The subject of paramount importance which was dealt with during the first session was that of the primary education of the country. And this not from the strictly educational point of view. Not with any determination to endow the new-born Union of South Africa, at the earliest possible moment, with a system of elementary education more sound than those which had prevailed in the four uniting colonies before May 31, 1910. The aims of those members of the Government who devoted their attention to the question of education during that first session were to ensure the application of the principles and ideals of their own race to the educational system of South Africa. It is true that in the end the resistance of the Unionists prevented General Hertzog from achieving his objects in this matter and that a compromise was arrived at which was agreed to by all Parties in the House. But no sooner was the session ended than the Government hastened to depart from this compromise on a point of importance. From that moment the English-speaking people of South Africa were filled with a deep distrust of the fairness of the

first South African Ministry when any question involving the respective rights of the white peoples of the country came to the front. In the second session of Parliament exactly the same thing occurred. During that session it was not the Defence Bill, not the Irrigation Bill, not the Miners' Phthisis Bill—though all were measures of the first importance from the point of view of the real interests of South Africa—which absorbed the attention of the Ministry and of the House. They were overshadowed by another question which again raised the racial issue, the question of compelling Government servants to learn the Dutch language. Forced to the front by General Hertzog and his followers, this claim that the Dutch-speaking people of South Africa had an inalienable right to exact a knowledge of their language from all Government servants as a condition of promotion above a certain rank, was, to the English-speaking people of the country, another proof that the principles and ideals of Afrikanderdom were regarded by their champions as being entitled to override any considerations of efficiency or economy. They were convinced, also, that the insistence of the Ministry as a whole on these claims showed that General Hertzog and his followers dominated both the Ministry itself and the Party which supported it. Nor was the attitude of Ministers during the recess which followed both the two sessions of Parliament calculated to lessen the strength of this conviction. To the English-speaking South African it is an elementary axiom that the great need of the country is a large increase of its white population. He is convinced that the great progress made during the last ten years by Canada and Australia has been due to the immigrants which they have been able to attract from Great Britain. He believes that in South Africa the only hope of any considerable increase to the white population is through the offering of similar inducements to immigrants. And he sees that South Africa has even a greater need of white men and women than Canada or Australia, because the native population of this country enormously outnumbers the white population, and the natural increase of the black man is more rapid than that of the white. But he also realises that the work of attracting white immigrants to South Africa is work which must be done by the Government and he has watched anxiously ever since Union for any sign that the Ministry in power has begun

to realise its duty to follow the example of recent Governments in the other Dominions. After the first session of the Union Parliament, General Botha went to England to attend the Imperial Conference of 1911. At that Conference he used the following words about immigration:

I am very much in favour of supporting emigration to South Africa; but I do not want (there) men who will be idle in the streets. I want agriculturists, and for that class I am prepared to spend money, and I hope . . . to make provisions to support our immigration scheme, because we are in favour of it, and we are going to encourage it to a very large extent, but at the same time I think we shall have to be very careful in bringing in or trying to bring in the best and the right men to South Africa.

While General Botha was engaged in declaring the policy of his Ministry to the Imperial Conference, however, General Hertzog in South Africa was stumping his native Province making violent speeches in opposition to immigration, which he denounced as sure to bring upon his country all the evils of congestion of population, squalid poverty, and industrial disputes. The inconsistency of such denunciations, on the part of one of the most prominent members of his Ministry, of the policy enunciated in Great Britain by the Prime Minister of the Union did not escape the notice of the English-speaking people of South Africa. They looked to General Botha on his return from Great Britain to assert himself and to denounce the irresponsible utterances of his Minister of Justice. He returned, and soon after his return he made a speech to his constituents in which he referred as follows to the question of immigration:

He had [he said] no idea why immigration had been made such a feature of during his absence, because his Party's programme clearly laid down the policy and to that he was pledged. He stated emphatically that he would first of all assist the tens of thousands now in the country to get on the land before he would assist one single man from outside.*

The inference, from the point of view of the English-speaking South African, accustomed to regard with reverence the tradition of Ministerial unanimity, was irresistible. General Botha, it was concluded, had found the extremists in his Party, led by General Hertzog, too strong for him. He had been obliged to surrender to them, and as a proof of his complacent acceptance of their dictation he had consented to make a public meal, in the presence

* Quoted from a report in the *Transvaal Leader*.

of his constituents, of the words which he had used about immigration to the Imperial Conference. It would be easy to multiply instances of such contradictions between the words used by the Prime Minister and by General Hertzog. Each instance served to confirm the impression of the English-speaking South African that General Botha was really the tool of the extremists in his own camp. And as the Prime Minister made speech after speech about the necessity for unity between the two white races of South Africa, about his desire to use his position as a means of reconciliation between them, and about his loathing of the man who should stir up racial hatred in the country, his British-born fellow citizens compared these high-sounding professions with his failure to restrain the bitternesss of his colleague and poured out their ridicule upon him. That General Botha himself was conscious of the irreconcilable inconsistency between his habitual exhortations and the speeches of General Hertzog is clear from a portion of the statement which he issued to the country after he had expelled General Hertzog from his Ministry :

> The pointed condemnation [said General Botha in that statement] by General Hertzog . . . of the policy of racial conciliation which the Government defends . . . was understood to mean that General Hertzog's policy was different from that of the Prime Minister and that therefore the Government seemed to speak with two voices. In these circumstances it was impossible for me to continue as head of the Government, and, as General Hertzog was not prepared to resign, nothing else remained for me but to dissolve the Government by my own resignation.

That General Hertzog, on his side, loathed and hated the policy of conciliation between the two white races of South Africa, consistently preached by General Botha, is shown by the following extract from the speech made by him in reply to General Botha's statement:

> He [General Hertzog] was said to have gone against that conciliation policy. Well, he had hardly ever used that empty word from any platform. But General Botha had used the word very often, so often as a matter of fact, that he [General Hertzog] had felt ashamed often at the manner in which General Botha's English friends in the papers . . . had held him up to ridicule.*

It would, in fact, be difficult to state the root of the Hertzog doctrine more plainly than it was stated by General Hertzog himself in another passage of the same speech :

* Quoted from a report in the *South African News*.

He would tell them where the real difference lay between himself and General Botha. He had said, and would continue to say it, that he was not going to lay the children and the interests of South Africa on the altar of Moloch, and if egoism and envy desired that the Dutch-speaking South Africans should always make sacrifices to the English-speaking South Africans to secure true conciliation, then he said the South African was not ripe for conciliation, and he for one refused to bring one child to the altar. He wanted conciliation, he desired unity; but unity of heart. He did not want to bribe any one for that conciliation. But the people of South Africa felt indignant, the Dutch-speaking people more especially, because they felt the interests of the Dutch-speaking people were being paid away as bribes, in order to obtain this conciliation.

There it stands in its naked lack of shame, the claim of the "pure Afrikander." The interests of the Afrikander are to be paramount in South Africa. Every claim which he chooses to make is to be conceded without question. His language is to be forced down the throat of every one who comes to the country. He is to have a preferent right to every kind of employment in the gift of the Government. The newcomer is to be regarded as an interloper and an adventurer, without civic rights except at the price of servility to the political Party which represents the views of the Afrikander. Amiable gentlemen in Great Britain have acclaimed the results of Union in South Africa. They have drawn affecting pictures of the reconciliation of Boer and Briton. They have hailed General Botha as the apostle of this reconciliation. And here he is denounced by the most prominent member of his first Ministry as a traitor to the ideals of the Afrikander people! He is accused of being willing to offer up the children of the Dutch-speaking people of the country as a sacrifice upon the altar of a spurious conciliation! The principles implanted in the people by those who reverence the Kruger tradition are said to be in jeopardy at the hands of the Prime Minister. So that, while the great majority of the English-speaking people of South Africa were convinced that General Botha had surrendered to General Hertzog, General Hertzog himself thought General Botha a traitor to his own people and desirous of conciliating English-speaking South Africans by the sacrifice of Afrikander interests.

The truth is—and this is the real lesson of the record of the first South African Cabinet—that there are in South Africa to-day two conflicting ideals. One ideal is the traditional ideal of the Dutch-speaking people. Its devotees see South Africa as a practically independent portion of the British Dominions; endowed

with the gift of self-government; set apart from European complications; isolated and dependent on herself alone for her own development. In the picture formed by this ideal the Dutch-speaking South African, having received the right of political predominance from Great Britain herself, conceives himself to be permanently entitled to that right. But he does not base his claim to unquestioned authority on that gift of Great Britain. His right is founded on the fact that he represents the man on the soil, as against the man of the towns. He does not look to any other country as "home." Your settler, if he has to leave South Africa, has somewhere else to go. The Boer is rooted in the soil of South Africa. Transplant him, and he withers. All this gives him, in his own eyes, a proprietary right in the country. To a large extent his life is still the patriarchal life of the pastoralist in a land of vast open plains. He looks on those who come to settle in South Africa as interlopers and foreigners, undesirables who should be driven into the sea if they prove turbulent or inconvenient disturbers of his peace. It has been the theory of those who have exaggerated the effect of Union that this ideal of the typical Boer had disappeared for ever with the formation of the first South African Cabinet. The events of the two and a half years during which that Cabinet held office have shown that this theory was wrong. When General Hertzog says, as he said in his last speech, that "as a Minister he was a Minister of South Africa and not of the Empire," he puts into a phrase the whole essence of the Boer ideal. When a cartoonist in a Dutch paper published in Cape Town shows the shade of Paul Kruger looking down upon the figure of General Botha, who wears the uniform of a British General, and saying "Louis Botha a British General! All is not well!" he expresses the innermost feelings of those who hold to the teachings of the Kruger tradition. For some time after Union, however, this ideal of the Dutch-speaking South African did not come into open conflict with the other ideal—that of the great majority of the English-speaking people. Englishmen in South Africa had agreed when their representatives signed the pact which made Union possible, that there should for the future be absolute equality of rights between the two white races. They recognised and respected the sentimental attachment of the Dutchman to his language and his national traditions. When the

Dutchmen began to force the pace the Englishmen murmured indeed but did little more. When every railway station and every public office throughout the country was plastered with notices in both languages; when a quarter of a million per annum was spent on the Union's printing, mainly owing to the claim of the Dutch that everything should be printed in both languages; when every Civil Servant who wanted to reach a post of responsibility was compelled by Act of Parliament to learn Dutch; when it was found that Dutch professional men were always chosen to do the Government work, that Government posts were always found for men who had given political help to the Party in power, that in such matters as the choice of teachers for the schools the mere knowledge of the Dutch language could override every other consideration of efficiency; the Englishman, though he felt that the bargain which he had made when he entered Union was being strained to the utmost in favour of the other side, and though he became more and more convinced that the extremist Dutch had captured the Ministry, was content to await the proper time and opportunity for making an effective protest. His ideal of the position of South Africa remained intact. He still saw her as his country, great in her possibilities, if hampered by her local conditions; great too as a member of the comity of nations which is the British Empire. He still believed that the day would come when she would recognise her obligations to the Empire and be no longer content to receive its protection without contributing anything to its burdens. He still felt, in short, that his ideal was secure; that the slow influence of time was on his side; that the day would come when light would break even into the dark back-country of South Africa and men be sent to Parliament who would realise that isolation meant for South Africa the ultimate predominance of the black man within and exposure to the land-hunger of Great Powers without. But with the end of 1912 this faith of the English-speaking South African in the ultimate triumph of his ideal received a rude shock. General Hertzog, speaking in the Rustenburg district of the Transvaal, declared the intentions of his faction with regard to the Empire:

Imperialism [he said] was important to him only when it was useful to South Africa, to its land and to its people, and when it was not serviceable he had respect for it from a distance; but as a South African he had little to do with it, and when it was contrary

to the interests of South Africa and the interests of the people of the country than he was a distinct enemy of Imperialism.

At these words the English-speaking people at last took serious alarm. Albany, the seat which had returned Dr. Jameson to the Union Parliament, was engaged at that moment in electing his successor. General Botha had made great efforts to capture the seat, having gone there specially to speak to the electors just before polling day. The Unionist candidate was returned by a majority of 831, though even the most optimistic Unionist had not expected a majority of more than 200. Colonel Leuchars, the Natal member of the Cabinet, insisted on resigning as a protest against General Hertzog's views on the Imperial issue, declaring that he would be no longer the colleague of a man who desired to use the Empire and then throw it away when he had finished with it as though it was a sucked orange. The two rival ideals, in fact, had clashed at last. The immediate result was to break the first South African Ministry. For General Botha, compelled at last to make his submission to, or himself subdue, the champion of the Kruger tradition, decided to take the more courageous course. How courageous his action was only those know who know the strength of the old Boer ideal in South Africa. Defying it, General Botha defies the sentiment of his countrymen, flouts their instinct for isolation and independence, reveals to them the meaning of the fact that they have sworn allegiance to the King of Great Britain. Such a lesson, read to them by the man whom they chose as their political leader, will not be a pleasant lesson or one which many of them are likely to learn without outcry and resistance. Opportunist as he has shown himself again and again since Union, willing to push compromise to the furthest limit, not too scrupulous in his methods of public controversy, ready to lay unjust reproach—quite knowingly—upon his political opponents, General Botha, by the last act of his first tenure of the Premiership of the Union has gone far to redeem himself with those who had become convinced that he was of the tribe of Reuben, unstable as water, doomed never to prevail. To-day, among those who hold the Imperial ideal, among those also who, without being Imperialists, believe that the Kruger tradition—as it brought on the Anglo-Boer War—would also involve South Africa in ruinous racial enmities, the name of General Botha stands for resistance

(though only at long last) to that tradition, even if it does not stand—and how could it fairly be expected to do so?—for whole-hearted championship of the Imperial ideal. To say even that is to say much to the credit of General Botha as head of the first South African Cabinet. His difficulties must have been great. Only those who know what they were have the right to judge him. And nothing, perhaps, has done so much to make his critics realise those difficulties as his final determination to refuse to tolerate General Hertzog any longer as a member of the Cabinet over which he presided.

TABLE MOUNTAIN.

GREATER BRITAIN AND INDIA

CANADIAN AFFAIRS

1

MR. R. L. BORDEN'S Resolution providing for a contribution of three "Dreadnoughts," costing £7,000,000, to the Imperial Navy was passed by a majority of thirty-two, which is fourteen below the normal Government majority on a "straight" party issue. Seven of the Quebec Nationalists, who had opposed Sir Wilfrid Laurier's amendment suggesting the creation of two Canadian Naval Units (which was defeated by forty-seven), voted against the Government proposals. The taking of the final vote was marked by a great outburst of patriotic enthusiasm, members rising and singing the National Anthem. Thus the most striking object-lesson in the essential solidarity of the Empire ever given *urbi et orbi* was duly enforced by a spontaneous overflow of Imperial sentiment. There is still some doubt as to the policy of the Opposition in regard to the Bill. A meeting of the Liberal Party will be presently held to decide whether or not a campaign of deliberate obstruction is to be held. Inasmuch as a majority of Canadian Liberals—nearly all, in my opinion, of those who are not professional partisans—are convinced that Canada should contribute without delay to the maintenance of Imperial sea-power, it is improbable that the opposition to the emergency vote will be seriously pressed. If it were decided to go to extremes and make use of the Liberal majority in the Senate, the very existence of that "secondary" Chamber would be menaced—and the average Senator's fear that he might lose his comfortable and well-paid berth would be sufficient to cause him to ignore the claims of party and take the side of the people. In the Senate, as in all constitutional organisms, the "will to live" is a

strong and persistent motive; and the opportunity of vindicating their position as a body above and beyond the littlenesses of professional politicians—an opportunity which has never before presented itself—would not be neglected by the Liberal Senators, many of whom, furthermore, are much stronger Imperialists and more conservative-minded than when they stood in the party firing-line and, when there was nothing better to do, peppered the very institution of which they are now a part with rhetorical buckshot. The abolition of the Senate is, and has always been, a plank in the Liberal platform, and the sight of the Liberal Party using it as a club to break the patriot's head would seem a negation of all his principles to the Liberal who takes his Liberalism seriously. I am convinced that the Leader of the Opposition will not commit the criminal blunder of opposing the wishes of the people, but will bow his head to a necessity that is largely of his own making—for he it was who brought the question of Canada's duty towards the Imperial Navy within the pale of practical politics. Whether he will make a virtue of necessity (in the way indicated in last month's notes) remains to be seen.

To the patriotism of Mr. R. L. Borden, who understands his people better than the elder politicians in his own and the Liberal Party, the chief credit of this striking object-lesson must be given. But the spade-work of Mr. J. S. Willison, the editor of Canada's greatest and most statesmanlike journal, must not be overlooked. He has done more than any living publicist to acquaint the home-keeping Canadian with the tendencies of world-business and world-politics, and, above all, with those of the predatory policy of the German Empire. He has exposed that international campaign of calumny which, finding daily expression in American speeches and articles and "news" manufactured in the United States (where the German-American element is now politically supreme), had gone far to convince Canadians that the Mother Country is not, in the words of Heinrich von Treitschke, "a wholly rotten thing that may stand for a time, but is certainly doomed."[1] Many Canadians accept the interested interpretation of Germany's ambition set about by the naturalised (but not denatured) aliens, whose Trust-earned cash clinks in the campaign-chest of the Potsdam party in Great Britain. But this unfortunate fact has its fortunate side; for the appearance in Canada of

apologists for German policy has set everybody considering the central problem of world-politics and discussing it seriously. And there can be only one end to such discussions among people who, like the Canadians, pay more attention to hard facts than to soft words—a certainty that the German battle-fleet, a solid fact that cannot be explained away, is intended to break the power of the British Empire when "The Day" arrives at last.

2

Even in Canada the towns are growing at the cost of the country, though the problem of urban congestion is not yet as acute as in the United States, where in little more than a decade the proportion of those who live in the towns has risen from 31 to 46 per cent. In spite of the opportunities of achieving a competence, if not of making a fortune, which are offered by the Western prairie region to the able-bodied, able-minded immigrant who makes agriculture his vocation, the increase of Canadian population since 1901 has been twice as great in the towns as in the rural districts. The truth is that neither in the United States nor in Canada is the country life loved for its own sake; in nine cases out of ten the farmer and his family look upon their land as merely a business investment, to be disposed of as soon as an adequate return—*i.e.* enough to live upon comfortably in the nearest town—has been secured by "wheat-mining" and by the unearned increment of its rise in value as a result of closer settlement. In England, a garden-land in comparison with the oldest portions of Manitoba or even of the Eastern Provinces, the landholder regards himself as the social superior of the dweller in the town, whether he is a professional man or engaged in business. In Canada and in the United States it is the other way about; storekeepers and lawyers *et hoc genus omne* patronise the farmer and the farmer's wife, regarding them as persons who are cut off from the social amenities of life. It follows that the statesmen of both countries are faced with the necessity of rendering the agricultural worker's lot more attractive by (1) providing him with hospitals, telephones, roads, &c., and (2) diminishing the hardships of making a start, and (3) fostering the intellectual interest in the agricultural pursuits which, as long as they involve a rule-of-thumb routine, cannot possibly retain in their service

the younger and more eager minds. In many of the Western States the encouragement of agriculture on scientific lines has been lavishly supported by State subsidies, or even by private munificence, and not only has the rush to the towns been arrested but the productivity of the land largely augmented—the latter an important consideration to a country which, in a generation or so, must cease to export the staple food-stuffs. In Canada the same far-seeing policy is to be vigorously carried out in future, and for that reason Mr. Burrell, the Canadian Minister of Agriculture, has introduced into the House of Commons a measure appropriating £2,000,000 during the next ten years to the furtherance of agricultural education. In this way it is hoped to eliminate by degrees the mere "wheat-miner" or get-rich-quick settler who-wastes the land for posterity in his anxiety to secure a competence and escape from a dull and soulless pursuit as soon as possible.

Two very useful books * have recently been published in which British emigrants of either sex will find a sufficiency of useful advice. Both authors warn their readers that Canada is not the Canaan described in the pamphlets of railway companies and firms dealing in real estate on a large scale. For all that, it is clear from what they say, even when throwing cold water on the fever of land speculation, that there is no other country in the world where the worker can so soon achieve his independence or the "working capitalist" obtain so high a rate of interest on the twofold investment of himself and his trifle of money. Mr. Talbot points out that the most profitable opportunities are often those which the newcomer creates for himself, and, to enforce this truth, relates the following dialogue between himself and a raw-boned, attenuated Eastern Canadian, who wanted to know what could be done in a sparsely settled region of Northern Ontario, a newer and nearer North-West where the French-Canadian *habitant* is cutting farms for himself out of the forests primeval:

"Say, stranger, been up North ?"

"Aye ! You going up there ?"

"Yep. Must do something."

* *Making Good in Canada.* By Frederic A. Talbot. Adam and Charles Black. 3s. 6d. net.

A Home-Help in Canada. By Ella C. Sykes. Smith, Elder & Co. 6s. net.

"Well, you've got on the wrong road. There's nothing doing."

"Ain't thar? Well, thar darn soon will be when I strike the place."

The dialect is not accurate, but the sentiment is quite in character. Wisely and courageously Mr. Talbot warns the emigrant to make use of his own common sense and scientific knowledge of farming and ignore the advice of the local duffer who has only been saved from bankruptcy by the abnormal fertility of the soil. The agricultural "old-timer," as he warns his readers, is more often than not a futile fraud:

> The average Western farmer is an overrated personality. He knows nothing about even the rudiments of his craft; fertilisation is an art beyond his knowledge; while how to obtain the maximum yield from the soil without exhausting it is a matter about which he is quite in the dark. After he has ploughed up the land with his much-lauded steam or petrol-driven plough, and has seeded it to wheat, oats, flax, and so on, he leaves it to its own devices to bring forth what it can. If he wishes to increase his aggregate production he does not attempt to study the soil to consummate this end, but merely ropes in a further area of virgin prairie for cultivation. . . . From my own observations of wasteful and incompetent methods I would urge the British emigrant not to follow in the Western Canadian's footsteps so far as this handicraft is concerned, but to resume in his new just what he has practised in his old home. If the Britisher wishes to investigate Canadian farming as it should be practised, then let him amble through the Maritime Provinces, where may be found a liberal commingling of the best and old-time British and French blood, with all the agricultural instincts developed to the finest degree, where the practice and produce are comparable with those of the most important agricultural countries of Europe.

Or he can take counsel with some successful settler from the Scottish Lowlands or from Ulster, or from one of those keen workers from the Western States who have taken a course in agriculture at one of the great Western universities. The time when, to show a profit, it was necessary to waste the land and economise labour has gone by in the Canadian West, and nobody can hope to succeed in agriculture unless he puts brains into his land. It is one thing to handle land that cost $3 an acre profitably, and another thing to do so when the price of the land has increased ten- or fifteen-fold.

Miss Ella Sykes has very pluckily hired herself as "help" to various farmers' and managers' wives, and she sets down her experiences with much good-humoured detail. There are easier ways of earning a livelihood, it would appear. But on the whole it is better to be the "home help" than the farmer's wife, especially if the husband has a mania for buying more land instead of adding to the comforts of the home. E. B. O.

INDIA

INDIAN MAHOMEDANS AND THE BALKAN WAR

THE Aga Khan, the political leader of sixty millions of Indian Mussulmans, has been admonishing his co-religionists regarding their attitude towards the Balkan War. His pronouncement is timely, for some of the younger generation of Indian Mahomedans have of late been saying very wild and windy things. In England the present position of Islam in India seems to be very little understood. One often hears vague apprehensions of the possible effect of Turkish defeats upon the Moslem population of the Dependency. It may be worth while, at this critical juncture in international affairs, to examine the question impartially, and try to decide what the undoubted restlessness among certain sections of Indian Mahomedans really amounts to.

The first point to consider is the exact degree of reverence which Indian Moslems pay to the claims of the Sultan of Turkey to be Khalif of Islam. If the "Young Moslems" of India were to investigate the subject historically, which few of them do, they would not talk so much nonsense about it, but would revert to the attitude of their graver forefathers. The Sultans of Turkey base their claim primarily upon a supposed nomination of the last Abbasid, who in 1538 is alleged to have chosen Sultan Suleiman the Great as his successor. Every Mahomedan *moulvi* knows in his heart that even if the story is true that particular basis of claim is unsound. The inexorable condition is that the Khalif must be of the blood of the tribe of the Koreish, from which the Prophet sprang; and the Sultans of Turkey do not fulfil that condition.

They have other grounds for their claim. One is that they are in possession of the Holy Relics, the Mantle and the Beard of the Prophet. These are kept in the old Palace at Seraglio Point, in Constantinople. Every year, in Abdul Hamid's time, the harbour was cleared of all shipping in that particular neighbourhood and the Sultan went down to venerate the Relics. Afterwards he was always wont to sit, absolutely alone, in the beautiful blue-tiled structure at the head of the point, called the Baghdad Kiosk. There his gaze would wander across the blue waters of the Bosphorus. North he would look towards Russia, southwards

towards the Holy Cities of Christendom and Islam. His solitary figure was not without a certain pathos. Abdul Hamid sat in the kiosk once a year for thirty years. Only once did he reveal his thoughts during that annual reverie. He was about to depart, and had beckoned to the officer in attendance. Turning to him, he said with indescribable sadness, as though soliloquising aloud: "Many of my forefathers have sat here. I often wonder whether, when I am gone, the people will say I did better or worse than they did." Abdul Hamid is a strange compound, and not altogether the monster poets have fancied him to be. Despite the *fetwa* of the Sheikh-ul-Islam, he probably remains the true Khalif in the eyes of the masses of his Ottoman subjects. The Turkish soldiery regarded him as Khalif; I doubt whether large numbers of Mahomedans in any other country have ever done so.

The Sultan's third claim to be considered Khalif is that he is the possessor of the Holy Cities of Islam. That is a claim which certainly counts for more with the people of India than the other two I have mentioned. It is really not very valid, for it might almost as well be said that the Sultan holds sway over Christendom because he possesses Jerusalem. Unless the Turks are more successful in bringing Arabia into subjection than they have been during the last twenty years, they may not long possess either Mecca or Medina. I may sum up this aspect of the question by saying that the Mahomedans of India have never attached very much weight to the three chief grounds on which the claim of the Sultan to be Khalif was based. They have turned to him in recent years rather as the sole remaining monarch of their faith who bulked largely in the world. He represented *izzat* (prestige) for Mahomedans.

In the old days Indian Mahomedans never bothered their heads about the claims of the Sultans of Turkey to the Khalifate. They were not accustomed to look towards "Roum" (Turkey). They knew that as the Sultan was not a Koreishi by descent he could not be a "Khalifa Kamil." They always used to pray for the "Hakim-i-Wagt," or "ruler for the time being," and asked that God would "render him favourably disposed to Mahomedans." Arminius Vambery once declared that when he was present at the Friday prayer in various mosques of Central Asia and Afghanistan he always heard the name of the

Sultan inserted in the Khutba before that of the reigning prince of the respective countries. I do not think Vambery saw much of Afghanistan except during a brief sojourn at Herat; and it is perfectly certain that in the reign of Abdur Rahman any person who dared to read the Khutba in Afghanistan in any other name than that of the reigning monarch would soon have lost his head. I should think, though I do not know, that Habibullah takes the view his father did. What is absolutely beyond dispute is that up to about the year 1878, while the Sultan was regarded by Indian Mahomedans as a great ruler in the Sunni world, he was never prayed for by name or as Khalifa in any Indian mosque. I believe that in a very large proportion of Indian mosques he is not so prayed for to-day. After Abdul Hamid's accession, however, thousands of pamphlets, prayer books, and Khutbas were circulated in India and wherever there were Mahomedans under British rule, designating the Sultan as Khalifa and giving what might be called the State-prayer in his name. Meanwhile tentative efforts were made to spread the principles of Pan-Islamism in India, but these efforts had very little practical result down to the year 1897. Up to that year pamphlets and Pan-Islamists were alike almost ignored.

1897 was the year of the Turko-Greek War. That conflict was pitiful enough, and brought no great credit to either side, but it was the very best stroke of luck that ever happened to Abdul Hamid. The Turkish successes roused the enthusiasm of the whole Mahomedan world. Exaggerated versions of the fighting stirred the tribes of the North-West Frontier, and unquestionably helped to bring about the Tirah War. In the Mahomedan quarters of the big cities of India there was much excitement. I remember wandering one night after the battle of Domokos into the Moslem bazaars of a great Indian city, and being dazzled by a veritable Feast of Lanterns in honour of the Sultan's victories. The great mosque was ablaze with twinkling lines of light from pinnacle to floor; the befezzed faithful were thronging through the doors to give praise to Allah; festoons of flags, garlands of flowers, and glowing lanterns hung from every Mahomedan house; and the Crescent flag was flaunted from balconies at every turn. It was at that time that one heard of the Sultan's name being mentioned in prayer in the mosques, though

only in a very few. The Mahomedans of India—or men who claimed on rather slender grounds to represent them—sent telegrams of congratulation to the Sultan. Abdul Hamid responded effusively, and promised to send special envoys to India, but the envoys never arrived and probably were never intended to arrive. The telegrams were merely a surface ebullition of no great account. Did not a hundred impulsive and rather foolish Members of Parliament at that time send a telegram to the King of Greece? One wonders whether any of these artless politicians ever heard what the distracted King said about them when he got their absurd message. The real measure of Indian regard for "the Khalif" was discovered when Abdul Hamid promptly tried to improve the occasion by asking for subscriptions for the Hedjaz Railway, which was supposed to symbolise the unity of the followers of Mahomet by the manner of its payment. In the eight or nine years which followed the Sultan's appeal for funds the Mahomedans of India subscribed only £18,000, of which sum one-third came from Rangoon alone. The fact was that festivals such as I witnessed in 1897 represented to the bulk of Indian Mahomedans simply an excuse for a *tamasha* (spectacle); the more intelligent among them were glad of an opportunity to show the world the unity of their religion; while a very small section were, as I have good reason to know, animated by political motives which were certainly reprehensible. The ardour of Indian Moslems for the Sultan soon died down again. When Abdul Hamid was reported to be critically ill nine years later, an appeal, issued by a Mahomedan organisation in Calcutta, urging that prayers should be offered in his behalf met with hardly any response.

There was one other aspect of the events of 1897 which deserves to be noted. The best and most respected Mahomedans in India strongly resented Abdul Hamid's manifesto setting forth the duties of all good Mussulmans towards himself, as Khalif. They openly regarded it as an unwarrantable assumption of a dignity to which he had no real claim. They pointed out that the Mahomedan religion commands its adherents to be loyal to their sovereign, and by this is meant the ruler in whose country they live, and not the Sultan of Turkey. Sir Syed Ahmed, certainly the greatest man Islam in India produced last century, spoke his

THE
NATIONAL
REVIEW

VOL. LX

SEPTEMBER 1912 TO FEBRUARY 1913

PUBLISHED BY THE PROPRIETOR

23 RYDER STREET, ST. JAMES'S, LONDON, S.W.

Printed by BALLANTYNE & COMPANY LTD
Tavistock Street, Covent Garden, London

CONTENTS OF VOL. LX

mind very plainly in the *Aligarh Institute Gazette*. He insisted that a Mahomedan sovereign only had the rights of a Khalif in the country wherein he was ruler. If a Mahomedan ruler had the temporal allegiance of a people, he could regard himself as the custodian and protector of their religious faith; but he could claim no allegiance, either temporal or spiritual, in countries where his rule was not established. Sir Syed Ahmed bluntly said: "Sultan Abdul Hamid is *not* and *cannot* be the Khalif for us Mahomedans who are the subjects of the British Government." He added that even the Sultan's position as guardian of the two sacred places of Islam did not confer upon him any prescriptive right to claim adherence from the whole Mahomedan world. Since the days of the Prophet there has been no supreme Khalif over all Islam. Unfortunately the younger men of Aligarh pay small heed now to the precepts of their great founder.

I have dealt at some length upon these topics because they have a very distinct bearing upon the situation to-day. If I venture to add a few words of advice upon that situation I may claim that I have some right to do so; for I have always tried to plead the cause of the Mahomedans of India, and fought their battle in days when they were not a power in Indian politics. I was once urgently summoned to the death-bed of an aged British general who had fought at the battle of Miani. His son is to-day a distinguished cavalry general occupying one of the highest posts in the service. The venerable soldier, whose fine strong features and long white beard made him seem like a prophet, said: "I have sent for you to urge you with my last breath always to do what you can for the Mahomedans of India. Their future troubles my dying hours. They are loyal now. God grant that they may always keep loyal! Never let the Government get out of touch with the Mahomedans. That is the great danger. If the Government ever lose touch with them evil will come of it, evil will come of it." He died the same day. I think I was afterwards told that those were almost his last words. I can never forget their impressiveness. Both before and after they were spoken I have done what I could. I had some share in the founding of the Moslem League, as certain of its originators will remember. I even christened it. The first proposal was to call the organisation the "Mahomedan Confederacy." I pointed out to the late Nawab

Mohsin-ul-Mulk, who had the matter in hand, that there was a shade of meaning in the name which might be misunderstood. I submitted several alternative names, one of which was "The Moslem League," and that was adopted with the prefix "All-India." The All-India Moslem League grew out of the movement to send a deputation to Lord Minto to state the grievances of Mahomedans. The movement involved a great deal of organisation in Mahomedan centres throughout India. I strongly urged Mohsin-ul-Mulk to try to convert his temporary organisation into a permanent one, as otherwise all his good work in bringing Mahomedans together for a united effort would soon lapse. He said that the same idea had already occurred to himself and others, and he intended to make the attempt. The outcome of the famous address to Lord Minto, which I gave some assistance in preparing, was the birth of the Moslem League.

Whatever the objects of the founders of the Moslem League may have been, I can say positively that the very last thing in their minds was the adoption of the programme of the Hindu organisation, the Indian National Congress. They never wished to express any hostility to Hindus, and certainly I had no such intention, for many of my best Indian friends are members of the Congress. My Mahomedan friends felt, and I felt, that the Congress platform as then enunciated—it was in the days when "Extremism" was fairly rife—was not suited to Mahomedan traditions; that Mahomedan interests could best be furthered by a separate organisation, working on its own lines; and that the Mahomedan community must undergo very great internal advancement before it was able sincerely to adopt some of the claims pressed upon the Government by the Congress. Unity of effort with the Congress was never dreamed of at that time. Things have changed indeed, and within the last few weeks there have been occurrences which might well make Sir Syed Ahmed and Mohsin-ul-Mulk turn in their graves. The Council of the Moslem League has adopted a resolution giving as one of its objects "the attainment of a system of self-government suitable to India." A prominent Mahomedan, Mr. Mazhar-ul-Haq, a member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council, has appeared on the Congress platform and declared: "A great and powerful party of liberal Mussulmans has arisen, whose aims and ideals are the aims and

ideals of the Indian National Congress." I believe his words to be true—for the moment. The Moslem League was only formed in 1906, and in seven years it has practically made its programme identical with that of the Congress. Mussulman and Hindu have joined hands for political purposes. No more significant event has happened in India for generations; yet it has passed almost unnoticed in England.

I do not believe this unity will be either real or permanent. A famous Mahomedan once said to me by the shores of a lake —and he will remember his words: "You can never fully comprehend the impassable gulf that divides Hindus from Mahomedans. No one can grasp it except ourselves. It is inherent in our beings. It enters into every act of our daily lives. It will take us a hundred years to bridge that gulf, and then you will see." I think these words are probably still true, though much has happened since they were spoken. The foundations of the piers of the bridge seem to me to be rapidly being made, and they will at least endure until a torrent sweeps them away. When I see my valued friend Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee and Mr. Mazhar-ul-Haq shedding tears of joyful reconciliation over each other on the Congress platform I remain a little sceptical, because I do not think it will last; but I do not meanwhile conjure up horrific visions of the possible results of the union of League and Congress. The Congress is a weak influence to-day, because men of both communities find better means of expressing their views in the reformed Councils; but in so far as the Congress still exists it seems to have recovered sanity and balance, and to have shed the evil tendencies that swayed it a few years ago. It presses for self-government. If the Moslem League is stimulated by the spectacle of the results of self-government in Turkey and Persia to make a similar demand I shall not criticise it. I have always believed that a far larger measure of self-government must be given to India in course of time; but the day has not yet come, nor will it arrive for a long period.

There are only two observations that I would make on the situation now evolved. The first is that, though the new union between Hindu and Mussulman politicians may not be very real, the Government cannot afford to take that view. The union may be artificial, but it will be maintained sufficiently well to enable

both communities to join in making demands which will be far more embarrassing than any ever advanced before. The second observation is that there must have arisen very great estrangement between the Government and the Mahomedans to induce the Islamic community to take this step. Out of all the splendid and unquestioning Mahomedan loyalty of a few years ago the Government of India and the India Office between them have evolved this situation. The loyalty remains: the Mahomedans of India are as loyal to the Crown as ever they were; but the political views of their leaders have been largely transformed. What has happened?

First, the downfall of Turkey has happened. I have explained the limited interest of Indian Mussulmans in Turkey until recent years. Even now the majority of them do not care very much about the claims of the Sultan as Khalifa, whatever the younger men may profess in public. But they are getting to care a great deal about the position of Islam in the world. To them Turkey and Persia have of late come to mean bulwarks of Mahomedanism; and when they see Italy in Tripoli, the Bulgarians in Thrace, and the Russians in Northern Persia, they vaguely but not inaccurately feel that their militant religion has suffered reverses. They resent British sympathy with the Balkan States, and it is natural that they should resent it. So far their position is reasonable. When they proceed, as speakers at Lucknow and Lahore have done, to make wild attacks on British policy, and complain that Great Britain has not unsheathed the sword in behalf of the Sultan, they are both unreasonable and foolish. British policy cannot be framed to meet the sentiments of the Mahomedans of India, sentiments often based on a false conception of their own religion and its traditions. It has to be framed on the world-needs of the British Empire, to which the Mahomedans of India owe sole allegiance, whatever they may pretend. Lord Curzon said in 1897 in the House of Commons that "British policy in Europe ought not to be dictated by considerations of the effect that policy may produce upon the inhabitants of her Majesty's empire in India." The same principle holds good to-day, and the young gentlemen from Aligarh who make spirited but impracticable speeches on Indian platforms may be counselled to remember it. Englishmen who understand sympathise with their feelings,

but British policy has to take thought of far greater considerations than the All-India Moslem League. The wisest Indian Mahomedans realise this fully. The Aga Khan, in the pronouncement to which I have referred, told the Moslems of India that they must work to establish a firm friendship between Turkey and England; and to that end they must do nothing to weaken England's confidence in Islam and in the loyalty of Indian Mussulmans. In the task of establishing such a friendship the British Government can fittingly take the lead in due season; but she cannot begin while Turkey is resolutely bent upon her own undoing. If the "Young Moslems" of India grieve for Turkey, and feel they must utter denunciations somehow, they will be better employed in denouncing the Committee of Union and Progress, which wrecked the Turkish Army, killed Turkey's bravest soldier, and hurled Kiamil Pasha from office when he was about to conclude a prudent peace.

I am well aware that there is deep and sincere feeling among the Moslems of India about the misfortunes of Turkey and Persia; but I may go on to say that I do not think it would have found such extravagant expression as has recently been heard had they not felt sore at their treatment in internal affairs. That is the real source of much of the trouble. The Indian Mahomedans were unwisely suffered to get thoroughly out of touch with the Government, and to brood over their grievances, some real, some not very reasonable. They wanted to vent their anger, and Tripoli and Khorasan and Macedonia and Thrace gave them all the opportunity they needed, and a great deal more. Their religious feelings were wounded, but internal politics had—and still have—far more to do with their attitude. The difficulty began at the time of the Morley-Minto reforms. The Mahomedans felt that they were made to fight hard, far too hard, for what they got, and that their treatment was a poor reward for their silent loyalty. Rightly or wrongly they got it into their heads that Lord Morley did not like Mahomedans, and was translating his feeling into action; these things spread far and wide in India. The Bengal business added to their dissatisfaction. The Mahomedans of Eastern Bengal had suffered much from the truculent provocation of their Hindu "brethren," and for five years their leaders kept them quiet, often with difficulty, while Moslems all over India gave them their

support. I am not now discussing the rights or wrongs of the Bengal question. I am only indicating one of the results of the final settlement. The Mahomedans of Eastern Bengal were told that the "partition" was a "settled fact," and that it would never be reversed. It was reversed, and the new province was destroyed. A solemn British promise was broken, the one thing that should never happen in India. At the Imperial Assemblage at Delhi a year ago I was asked to see a Mahomedan magnate who was greatly distressed at what was coming, and found him in tears. On the night of the Durbar a Mahomedan, whose name is a household word, strode into my tent and angrily exclaimed: "When will you English learn to keep your word?" I could give many such instances. I speak of what I know. The wounds have perhaps been healed, but the scars remain, and they are deep. "Had we agitated," said the Mahomedans, "we would not have been treated thus," and I knew they were right. They are going to agitate now and under the interested incitement of their new Nationalist allies, they are using the Balkan War chiefly as a pretext. Another and very serious cause of Mahomedan estrangement is the attitude of the Government of India regarding the proposed Moslem University at Aligarh. Every Mahomedan leader is interested in this University scheme, and has been for years. It is a project very dear to all their hearts. They have got at cross-purposes with the Government about it, and I fear the University dispute, and the bitterness it has aroused, has more to do with the change of front of the Moslem League than any other single influence. The Aligarh people are sometimes very prickly, and Aligarh has not in all respects always been well or wisely controlled; but it does not seem that the Government have handled the issue very tactfully, and they should strain every nerve to find some solution.

The duty of the Government is to try to restore the impaired confidence of Indian Mahomedans. The duty of Indian Mahomedans is to keep their loyalty to the Crown unabated, whatever political programme they may adopt. The duty of the "Young Moslems" is to cease talking nonsense about international politics.

ASIATICUS.

THE
NATIONAL REVIEW

No. 362. APRIL 1913

EPISODES OF THE MONTH

Men v. Money

ALTHOUGH the continuance in office of the Asquith cabal, who have hopelessly compromised themselves by the code they have now unblushingly proclaimed as governing "men of honour," is a daily and hourly humiliation to their countrymen and their country which cannot fail to react upon our prestige abroad, we are entitled to hope that the mendacity mania has not spread to foreign affairs, and that our Foreign Minister's word is still as good as his bond. The Foreign Office has, so far as we know, though we confess that our knowledge is limited, kept clear of the dirty tricks which seem to be a positive obsession in several other Departments. We shall still think of British policy, so far as it concerns international relations, as governed by the pre-Asquith code rather than by that which now openly and admittedly regulates our domestic affairs, and which may be compendiously summarised as "the end justifies the means." As "the end" is the maintenance in power of the Asquith clique, everything, however vile and vicious, calculated to promote that object is permissible. The deterioration of the standards of public life is the topic of the hour, and we can only hope that a relief from the present purgatory may be at hand, in spite of the Hebrew clutch upon the Radical Party, and the spread of Hebrew power and Hebrew ideals in Parliament, in the Press, finance, and society. It is the old struggle between men and money. Cynics believe that men have no chance against money, while idealists believe that in the long run men can beat money, but unfortunately idealists are handicapped by the innumerable idiots within their own ranks who infinitely aggravate the difficulties of the struggle and not infrequently play the game of the enemy. Nevertheless we believe that the idealists will win the day, though the contest may be long and will certainly be severe, and the sinister forces now mobilised to degrade this country will be completely routed. Meanwhile apart from the domestic struggle we must work to

keep as much of our policy as possible outside the sphere of the newly accepted creed.

In this, although Sir Edward Grey is lamentably weak towards his colleagues, from whom he will submit to almost anything—coolly standing aside while the Departments, on the strength and efficiency of which his policy depends for success, are starved of essentials, stultified and rendered practically impotent—he has hitherto resisted the influences and interests now pushing their way into every nook and cranny. The British Foreign Minister is not loved by German Jews and cosmopolitan financiers generally, though if he continues to imagine that plain facts can be ignored, that the Army is safe in the hands of one wind-bag, and the Navy in the hands of another, while the air is safe without even a wind-bag to look after it, the time will shortly come when the affection which the enemies of this country openly lavish on the Asquith Government may extend to the one Minister who, to his honour be it said, has hitherto escaped German enthusiasm. Leaving opinion, sentiment, and attitude as represented in finely shaded speeches for actualities, the outlook is not brilliant, as England seems to be under an eclipse which we may trust will, like other eclipses, be temporary. Her politicians may amuse themselves and bemuse us by speaking with the old tone of authority, but the voice does not carry because it is known to be little but a voice. Abroad we observe patriotic Governments making stupendous efforts to prepare against the evil day which is hastening upon Europe. Not only have the relations of the two Great Powers constituting the Dual Alliance become yet more close and cordial, not only is there a perfect understanding between St. Petersburg and Paris as to common action against a common aggressor, but both Powers, though one of them is Parliamentary, appreciate the fact that the world is governed by deeds and not by words, and that safety lies in serious, solid, systematic, self-sacrificing preparation, for a modicum of which Lord Roberts is continually appealing to great gatherings of his fellow countrymen who assemble to hear him in our centres of industry, and whose attitude at any rate offers an encouraging contrast to that of the vast majority of our public men. Across the water we see the most democratic nation in Europe, which

Hebrews on the Warpath

on Radical theories should be exclusively populated by Potsdam patriots because there is no Throne, no House of Lords, no Established Church, one man, one vote, payment of members, and all the other approved marks of undiluted democracy, preparing to consecrate yet another year in the life of the manhood of the country by raising the term of military service from two years to three. What is really splendid about this drastic reform is that the impulse springs from the young generation and not from an elder generation vainly calling upon youth to rise to the height of their responsibility as the coming custodians of their country.

French Effort

THERE has, it is true, been an inopportune change of Ministry in Paris, and M. Barthou temporarily occupies the uneasy post vacated by M. Briand, but the main lines of policy remain and the Three Years' Service Bill would appear to be safe, however precarious the life of Ministries. With us everything is precarious except the life of Ministries, but even that can't go on for ever, and our shrewder place-at-any-price politicians regard their days as numbered, though whether the Empire will escape their thraldom in time to escape catastrophe has now become an open question. France is not making these tremendous efforts in any spirit of aggression, as the Potsdam Party in this country affects to believe, but simply and solely because with Frenchmen everything is subordinate to the supreme question of the safety of the State, and the recent and most menacing development of German armaments by land and sea, accompanied by the imposition of sensational taxation unknown in peace time, opened the eyes of the most optimistic Frenchmen to the fact that Germany evidently regarded the time as approaching to deal the knock-out blow for which she has long been itching. As showing the length to which papers of Potsdam proclivities are prepared to go in their vendetta against our friends and their campaign for our enemies, it is noteworthy and should not be forgotten, as it certainly will not be forgotten in France, that the *Westminster Gazette* invited its readers to believe with the magnificent disregard of dates and facts which is characteristic of Potsdam journalism, that the expansion of German armaments was a reply to France, whereas all the world knows that it was Germany who took the initiative which has forced France to make her present effort. We need

not discuss these questions at length because the ground is completely covered not only by Lord Roberts' magnificent Wolverhampton speech, which we are privileged to publish, but also by the incisive article by Lord Percy and the observations of Ignotus. What is painful to Englishmen is that France is compelled to make such efforts simply and solely because this country refuses to make any serious effort whatsoever. We will not exasperate our readers by reference to the truly grotesque speech which Colonel Seely inflicted on the House of Commons on the Army Estimates, except to say that the speaker would have been hooted out of any serious, well-informed assembly. Nor need we waste our space by reproducing the pæans of the Churchill Press on the performances of the mountebank at the Admiralty who has repeated the criminal folly of several of his predecessors by appealing to Germany to cease shipbuilding. If the appeal were heard its only effect would be to increase the burden on France, and it can therefore only be regarded as an act of treachery to the *Entente*, but its single result is to excite derision and contempt in Germany though we have no doubt that as her main object is to destroy the *Entente*, she might be willing to make some bogus arrangement which would not deprive her of a single unit, but could be used by the Potsdam Party here as a pretext for transferring naval supremacy to Germany without the need of her firing a shot.

Perfide Albion

To make things worse we have our demoralised Prime Minister issuing declaration after declaration calculated to convey the idea that we are under no obligation to assist France in the event of her being attacked by Germany, though we are, of course, aware that Mr. Asquith's ambiguous statements can be interpreted differently according to the taste and fancy of the interpreter. But this only makes things worse. At this moment our Government are playing the game of our enemies by enabling them to revive the legend of *perfide Albion*, which was supposed to have been finally laid by the loyalty and steadfastness of Sir Edward Grey. The Potsdam Party will, of course, merely take another tumble, but it is a nuisance to have even to discuss the question, though it should only redouble the determination of all patriotic Englishmen to do whatever lies in their power to send the Marconi Ministry about its business.

The War

Some British politicians imagine that the war in the Far East can be terminated by a speech from the Treasury Bench, the rest of the, world hopes that it may shortly cease in the usual way, namely, by the defeat of one belligerent by the other. This is in effect actually happening, though we are not out of the wood, as victory naturally elates the victor and inclines him to ask for more than his victim is willing to grant, and considering the dismal record of the so-called Great Powers (wittily rechristened *Les grandes Impuissances*) on the Near Eastern question we can hardly be surprised if their writ does not run so freely as it should among the smaller Powers who have put their fortune to the touch, risking all but gaining all. The outstanding feature of the war since the collapse of the negotiations in London has been its profound secrecy and the complete success with which the civilised world has been kept in ignorance of the operations. At the end of March comes the great news of the capture of Adrianople by the Bulgarians and Servians—a glorious episode in the annals of both combatants, because if the Turks have lost they have at any rate saved their honour. The gallant and determined defence of Ghazi Shukri Pasha will live in history, together with the notable feat of arms of the conquerors. Details are lacking at the moment of writing, though it is believed that the Bulgarian General Staff, ably supported by the Servians, concentrated all efforts since the resumption of hostilities on securing this prize. The Turkish garrison is stated to have consisted of 60,000 men with 300 field- and 45 machine-guns. This great modern fortress was regularly invested by the enemy under the command of General Ivanoff—the siege beginning on October 18—and during the latter phase of the war, according to the *Times* military correspondent, the mission of the other armies was to prevent any interruption of the siege, which they effectually did.* At Easter there seems to have been a general attack on Adrianople, presumably reduced to sore straits, which was successful, and on March 26 Shukri Pasha surrendered to General Ivanoff. Meanwhile the brilliant capture of Janina in the beginning of March by the Greeks, who have highly distinguished themselves throughout the war, and the surrender of Djavid Pasha and a large Turkish force to the Servians afford further evidence of the invincibility of the allies, of whom little Montenegro alone has failed to gain her objective.

Scutari, which, however, the Powers have decided to incorporate in a new autonomous Albania.

The tension on this question between Russia and Austria-Hungary appears to have abated, each side having made concessions to the other, and both Governments having shown praiseworthy self-restraint and moderation. The Powers would now like the belligerents to throw down their arms and appeal to their superior wisdom to apportion the spoils at a solemn Conference. But the Bulgarian guns are still booming away at Tchataldja, and it is not known how far the spirit of accommodation prevails among those who have borne the brunt of a bloody war, for which the conspicuous lack of European foresight bears its share of responsibility. One great tragedy has overshadowed the close of this struggle, namely, the assassination of King George of Greece, the brother of Queen Alexandra, who was shot by some degenerate as he was strolling about Salonika, where he had taken up his abode since it fell into the hands of his gallant subjects, and lived a simple, unostentatious existence, taking his walks abroad without any precautions, to the great anxiety of his Ministers and Courtiers. He died at once, and he cannot be said to have been unfortunate in the moment of his death, for he lived to be associated with the realisation of Greek aspirations, and his wisdom in supporting the great statesmen to whom the regeneration of modern Greece is so largely due, and the gallantry of his own family, headed by a brilliant soldier, the Crown Prince, must have made King George's dying thoughts happy. In this country the utmost sympathy has been expressed for the Greek people in the affliction they have sustained, and a further opportunity has been afforded us of showing the profound affection with which Queen Alexandra is regarded throughout the United Kingdom and the British Empire. We cannot help feeling that with the dangerous tendency of maniacs in search of self-advertisement to strike at heads of State that the Press should seriously consider the undesirability of giving publicity to the names of these dastards, as indeed of other outragemongers who live for the purpose of keeping in or getting into the limelight. It is difficult to get an agreement among newspapers about anything, but it should be possible

A Tragedy

for concerted action in order to prevent this most loathsome form of advertisement.

A Debt of Honour

The domestic kaleidoscope revolves so rapidly that it is quite impossible for a monthly observer to keep pace with its revolutions. Periods of apathy and excitement alternate in such a manner as to render the observations of to-day stale, flat, and unprofitable to-morrow, so we apologise in advance to our readers if comments written at the end of March are already out of date at the beginning of April. Parliament resumed its wearisome labours on March 6 (after a cruelly brief adjournment), when some necessary business was hustled through in the familiar Asquith manner, *inter alia* a humiliating " climb down " by the Government, who had unsuccessfully tried to bluff the House of Lords over their own Railways Bill, which it will be remembered was founded upon the compromise between the railway companies and the Government which terminated the famous strike in August 1911, it being agreed that the costly concessions of the companies under pressure of the Government should to some extent be recouped by increased rates and freights. When this Bill came before the House of Commons all the vote-catchers were on the war-path. Ministers capitulated after their wont, and a limit of five years was introduced in violation of the compact between the Government and the Companies, which was unlimited as regards time. This was so dishonourable a proceeding that even the Prime Minister on reconsideration could not defend it, and as the House of Lords insisted on striking out the time limit, Mr. Asquith moved that the deletion of that clause should be agreed to, and the Government Bill was thus restored to its original form. The Coalition barks but rarely bites, and though there was plenty of barking on the present occasion, the Lords for once gained the day—people can only gain the day by standing to their guns—and thus one small Ministerial " debt of honour " has been redeemed. On the other hand, the Lords found themselves, or deemed themselves, constrained to surrender over the Trade Unions Bill, in which they had inserted an amendment prohibiting the employment of Trade Union funds in the publication of a political newspaper unless such action was approved on a ballot by a majority of the

members voting. The Attorney-General moved to disagree with this excellent amendment. The Opposition acquiesced rather than lose a Bill which is regarded as useful in other respects and which undoubtedly the Unionist members on the Committee succeeded in licking into some sort of shape. The Lords acquiesced in the Opposition's acquiescence. Nevertheless the result is regrettable, as unfortunate working men are now liable to have their hard-earned savings squandered by an ambitious caucus without their consent in a form of investment in which probably more money is lost per annum than in any other, except possibly theatres.

Another Session

ON the following day, March 7—the dates are interesting as indicating our Parliamentary Rakes' Progress—Parliament was prorogued "with the ancient and picturesque ceremonies," but it was only prorogued over a week-end, as our jaded legislators reassembled for another session on Monday, March 10, when once again, with the usual ceremonial, the King in person, accompanied by the Queen, opened Parliament for the express purpose of enabling a detestable, detested, and despised Government to place on the Statute Book behind the backs of the people measures which are equally unpopular and odious, conspicuous among them being the Bill to establish civil war in Ireland and the "meanest measure" to despoil the Welsh Church in order to gratify hostile Tabernacles. His Majesty wore his Crown—a practice abandoned in the reign of Queen Victoria and now happily revived. If we may respectfully say so, the more the Crown is in evidence in these evil days the better for the nation and the Empire. We know that his Majesty, like some of his illustrious predecessors, is surrounded by a zareba of false and treacherous counsellors—Bismarck, who was an expert in such matters, told the world that it was easier to mislead a Sovereign than a Parliament, which is saying a great deal—who tell King George the same falsehoods that they tell the people; but we may console ourselves by looking forward to the time when they will be found out by both and sent about their business. The enlightenment of the nation as to the character of the men composing the Cabinet is proceeding apace. As the French say, "La verité est en marche." Let us hope it will reach the most exalted quarters. Nothing was more striking and encouraging on the opening day than the

popular ovation to the King and Queen, whose ungrudging devotion to their duties give their Majesties an ever-increasing hold on the affection of their subjects. The only contretemps of the function was a minor misfortune to the equipage of the German Ambassador, upon which superstitious persons have founded portentous prophecies. The Speech from the Throne opened with a touching reference to the fact that the day was "the fiftieth anniversary of the marriage of my parents," the King adding: "I cannot forego the opportunity of expressing for My dear Mother and Myself our grateful sense of the devoted affection of the nation which it has been Her happiness to enjoy for so many years and which remains to console and support Her in Her abiding sorrow." Relations with Foreign Powers continued to be friendly. Last December an armistice had been arranged between the belligerent Governments in South-East Europe, which chose London as the place for their peace negotiations, "and I welcomed the delegates who were sent for that purpose and gave them every facility that was in My power."

Oversea Dominions

After an expression of regret at their failure to agree and consequent continuance of the war, the Royal Speech referred to the earnest desire of the Great Powers to prevent the conflict from spreading and to see it terminated as soon as possible. "The possible developments of the war and the changes that must result from it cannot be without interest for the Great Powers who are neutral and were parties to the Treaty of Berlin." The British Government had especially through the Ambassadors in London "kept in close touch and co-operation with the other Powers in the endeavours, in which all have shared, to preserve concerted view and action, and to establish agreement on all points on which differences might arise between any of them." A large measure of success had been achieved, agreement having been reached in principle "on matters of the greatest importance," though some were still under discussion, and hope was expressed that a complete understanding amongst the Great Powers with a beneficent influence on the conclusion of the war might be attained. There were likewise appropriate references to the visit of the Canadian Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) and several of his col-

leagues to this country, as also to that of the New Zealand Minister of Defence. This is a decided improvement, as nothing was more conspicuous, taking the Royal Speeches from the Throne during the earlier days of the Radical régime, than the niggardly references to the Oversea Dominions, in which his Majesty is known to take the keenest personal interest, as, unlike his Ministers, he has seen them with his own eyes and realises their possibilities. Now that the Cabinet feel that their skins are involved in the perilous plight to which they have reduced the country by deliberately and wilfully neglecting the safety of the State by sea, by land and overhead, and are constrained to go whining round the Dominions in whose faces doors used to be "banged, barred and bolted," the Royal Speech, for all the political part of which Ministers are responsible, strikes a different note, which, however tardy, is none the less welcome and will be duly appreciated throughout the Empire. Upon Imperial Defence there is the following paragraph:

I am confident that such an exchange of views between members of its responsible Governments will promote the solidarity of the Empire. The recent gift of a battleship by the Malay States, the ready consent of the New Zealand Government to the retention in the North Sea Fleet of the battleship contributed by them, the steady progress towards the establishment of the Australian Fleet, and the discussions now proceeding in the Canadian Parliament on matters of defence, testify to the universal desire within the Empire for the maintenance of common safety.

Then followed a reference to India which we may be equally sure was spoken from the heart:

In my Indian Empire, on the 23rd December, at the ceremony of the State entry into Delhi, a wicked attempt was made on the life of my Governor-General and Viceroy. Through the mercy of Divine Providence the plot failed in its full intent, but I deeply regret that innocent lives were sacrificed and that the Viceroy was gravely wounded. The fortitude of the Viceroy and Lady Hardinge, and the disciplined courage of all the officers of Government, have my warmest admiration. I gratefully acknowledge the expressions of sympathetic loyalty which the crime has evoked from the ruling chiefs and from all classes of my Indian subjects.

Legislative Menu

This part of the Royal speech closed with a reference to the Commission now perambulating India, from all accounts with the most disastrous results owing to its personnel and procedure, and the only satisfactory announcement that could be made with regard to this maladroit body is that its labours had been wound up and that its members had returned to the various places they

same from. There are, needless to say, able and admirable members on this Commission, but they can do practically nothing to counteract the mischief of intriguing and idiotic colleagues. The legislative programme as adumbrated in the Speech from the Throne contained no surprises, the gist lying in the following paragraph: "The attention of Parliament will again be asked to the measures in regard to which there was disagreement between the two Houses last Session." The plain English of this is that the Bill to place the loyal population of Northern Ireland under the heel of the Molly Maguires, which is the price of the retention of office by Toe-the-line Asquith and Co., will again be brought forward and without serious discussion will be registered by the Coalition Caucus, without the faintest regard to the feelings of either the Irish or the English towards this preposterous and utterly impossible measure. Ditto as regards the Welsh Disestablishment Bill, which is simply a sop to the social envy of the more uncivilised elements in Wales. A measure to facilitate land purchase in Ireland, which has been deliberately obstructed by Mr. Birrell and his task-masters, was also mentioned among the legislative items, together with a bounty or subsidy from the Imperial Exchequer to the Government of the Sudan, "for ensuring the prosperity of that territory and the development therein of the industry of cotton growing." As the prosperity of a large part of Lancashire depends on the amount of raw cotton available, and as what Free Traders call "the natural supplies" are relatively shrinking, protective measures must be taken in the interests of the county palatine, which returns a large number of Radical Members to Parliament. We entirely approve of the method and of the principle, but we desire to see them extended to other great industries which under the stress of foreign competition are lagging in the race, and especially is it important to preserve all the preferences we now enjoy throughout the British Empire, which we can only hope to retain by a policy of Imperial reciprocity.

Protection of Lancashire

THE protection of the raw material of Cottonopolis by a Cobdenite Government is none the less a sensible measure because it is calculated to make Richard Cobden turn in his grave and to convince him that Free Trade was a colossal fallacy. The Speech also contained the usual promise of a Bill "for the better care and control of the

feeble-minded," of which we are, however, not likely to hear very much more, as any serious measure of this character might conceivably restrict certain parliamentary activities. There was likewise a suggestion of an Education Bill, upon which the Windbag on the Woolsack has been making the same amorphous speeches which he used to devote to the "nation in arms." But the only item that interests the Coalition in the legislative menu is "a Bill for the prevention of plural voting at parliamentary elections." Our opponents are of opinion that if they can manage to jockey through a measure of disfranchisement without any redistribution they will be able, while maintaining the most glaring electoral anomalies, to transfer a useful number of seats from the Unionist to the Marconi party. The Debate on the Address followed the usual course, though it was perhaps more humdrum and lifeless than ever, for the simple reason that not only is the country almost sick unto death of politics, but the politicians themselves are hopelessly stale and cannot conceal their boredom. Two mushroom barons, Lords Aberconway and Ashton of Hyde, ornaments of the Radical Plutocracy, respectively moved and seconded the Address in reply to the Speech in the House of Lords, after which Lord Lansdowne roamed in graceful and decorous fashion over the field of politics, followed by the newly created Marquis of Crewe, K.G., who was even more dreary and inarticulate than ever. Happily, the debate was over in three hours. There was slightly more stir and animation in the Commons, but not very much. Mr. G. Collins, a youthful Democrat suitably arrayed in a Court dress, and Mr. F. Maclaren, ditto ditto, were the mover and seconder respectively. Mr. Bonar Law succeeded in making, what one would have thought impossible after the strain of the past year, a fresh and effective speech, to which we only wish we were able to do justice. He showed a remarkable capacity for discussing every question, great and small, and for placing topics in their proper perspective. He was equally at home on Foreign affairs, Imperial Defence, the Fiscal system, cotton growing in the Sudan, and the sugar-beet industry,

to which I attach a great and perhaps, though I do not think so, an exaggerated importance. . . . I have thought for a long time that the Government of this country ought long ago to have done something to try to establish that industry. I remember that the Prime Minister on the occasion of a debate in connection with the Sugar

Convention expressed his sympathy with this object. I think it is precisely the kind of industry which is now necessary in this country, and I hope the Government will tell us that they are prepared to do something to help in establishing this industry in the United Kingdom.

The "Preamble"

If we single out this passage from the speech of the Leader of the Opposition it is not because it is the most important, but rather because it indicates useful constructive effort. If Lord Denbigh obtains the support which his unremitting labours deserve in this excellent cause, we should be able to force the hands of our contemptible Cabinet and compel them to promote an industry for which many parts of this country are eminently fitted. Mr. Bonar Law also recurred to one of his favourite subjects, namely, the Government's debt of honour to carry out the Preamble of the Parliament Act and reform the House of Lords, to which there was no allusion in the Royal Speech. "By not including it in the programme for this session the Government have openly abandoned the only argument on which they excused their delay in not dealing with it simultaneously with the relations between the two Houses. They told us then that they could not deal with the reform of the Second Chamber till they had obtained the leverage which the Parliament Act would give them. And now what are they doing? They have given up the lever even if they introduce a Bill next year. They cannot use the Parliament Act to carry it through because there is no time before another election." Mr. Asquith as usual was furious and futile, contenting himself with the statement: "Not only are we under a distinct obligation to fulfil this intention, but we have the strongest possible interest in doing so. Does anybody think it is to our interest as a Government and our interest as a party indefinitely to postpone the reconstitution of the Second Chamber?" &c. &c. To add insult to injury, at a later date (March 12) Mr. Herbert Samuel—so much in view at the present time as Postmaster-General—was put up to declare that the Government really had a scheme for reforming the House of Lords within the lifetime of the present Parliament; they would create a Second Chamber with no vestige of the hereditary principle and in no circumstances would they restore the veto. Our readers

may judge for themselves by Mr. Herbert Samuel's performances during the last year on Marconi matters—which after all are within his own Department—as to the value of any statement he may make in the House of Commons. We shall believe in the Government Bill for reforming the House of Lords when we see it, or rather when it becomes law, as we quite conceive that it might be mentioned in Speech after Speech from the Throne, and even attain the honour of a second reading in several successive sessions in the House of Commons, but that would not indicate any intention on the part of Ministers to place it upon the Statute Book. Indeed, considering the insatiable greed of the Radical plutocracy for every form of honour, especially hereditary honours, and considering that they pay the piper of the Party and are consequently able to call the tune, we do not for a moment imagine that Mr. Asquith, even were he sincere (of which there is no evidence), would be able to carry any such measure as that foreshadowed by the egregious Postmaster-General. The ominous silence which the latter's announcement caused on the Radical benches could almost be heard in the Press Gallery.

The Labour Party

IT is unfortunate that the Labour Party should have sunk into being a sort of "tame cat" to the Coalition, content to lap up whatever milk Radical Whips may place in its saucer. Every now and then a Labour member breaks loose and shows himself to be worthy of a better fate than hanging on to the coat-tails of an Elibank, an Oilybank, or an Illingworth. The discussion on the Address initiated by Mr. Snowden (March 13) on the condition of the people was painfully interesting, even though his picture was over-coloured and the remedies calculated to aggravate the disease. The proper function of the Labour Party, if it is to be worthy of its name, is to keep Labour questions before Parliament—always remembering, however, what many so-called spokesmen of Labour forget, that working men are citizens like other classes of the community and that citizenship, as Lord Roberts so eloquently preaches, implies duties and obligations as well as rights and privileges. What we complain of in the Labour Party—and we do not believe that on their present

lines they will long impose on the masses—is that, speaking generally, they fail in all their duties to those to whom they owe their political existence by allowing parliamentary energies to be absorbed in measures utterly useless and distasteful to the masses, such as Home Rule and Welsh Disestablishment, which are exclusively middle-class movements. In other words, the so-called Labour Party are rapidly becoming the tools of the Radical plutocracy, who seek to divert attention from their economic and political misdeeds by arousing bitter class-hatreds against other forms of plutocracy less plutocratic than themselves. Mr. Snowden may exaggerate in the distressing disclosures he made to the House of Commons as to the poverty-stricken condition of the poor in this prosperous paradise of free imports daily hymned by the Radical millionaire press. It is no doubt delightful to think of Cobdenite cotton lords, Cocoa magnates, chemical manufacturers, and soap-boilers overflowing with money. They present, however, a strange and perilous contrast to their less-favoured countrymen, and if England is the heaven of the Radical plutocrat it is something approaching the purgatory of the victims of that plutocrat in whose interests wages are deliberately and artificially kept down by our cruel, cold-blooded Cobdenite system, which, as we know from the *Life of Cobden*, emanated from the same class who are now concentrating their vast accumulated—and in some respects ill-gotten—wealth in upholding it.

Unionist Attitude

Mr. Snowden's picture of the present plight of the poor may be usefully compared with the remarkable article elsewhere from the pen of Lord William Cecil, who writes with rare knowledge and sympathy, and is entirely free from any class-prejudice in his diagnosis of the situation. It is a peculiar satisfaction to us to publish this paper in the *National Review*, which is identified in the minds of some with the ridiculous idea that the whole duty of Government and politicians is to consecrate their attention to external problems, to Imperial problems, to National Defence, and generally to those matters which may be comprised under the heading Prestige. The present number contains abundant evidence of the immense importance we necessarily attach to maintaining our position

among the Great Powers, to the development of Imperial resources, and to the supreme question of the safety of the State—subjects which are woefully neglected by too many politicians of all parties; but at the same time we have always acknowledged that among the most vital problems is the condition of the great mass of the people, upon whose health, physique, efficiency, character, and general well-being our very existence depends. We share to the full the anxieties expressed by Mr. Snowden and Lord William Cecil as to the crisis in the condition of the people, which finds vent in frequent outbursts of irrepressible discontent. Without advocating universal panaceas, we attribute no inconsiderable part of the present misery to the sweating system miscalled Free Trade, and we are encouraged in this belief because, so far as we can gather, in spite of the falsehoods concocted on the premises of the Cobdenite press and the faked foreign telegrams they publish to dupe their innocent readers, the economic outlook in England to-day is infinitely worse than that in any progressive Protectionist country, for the simple reason that, whereas here there is nothing to compensate the wage-earners for the increased cost of living, elsewhere the available evidence shows that increased wages have counteracted, and in many cases more than counteracted, increased prices. Therefore, whereas our people are decidedly worse off than they were, the people of progressive Protectionist countries are at least as well off and in many cases better off. Surely on the face of it that is a complete and crushing condemnation of the British fiscal system of unrestricted free imports, and those who sincerely have national interests at heart, whatever their political denomination, should join hands for the purpose of trying a serious experiment in Tariff Reform, even though it be disapproved by the Cadburys, the Brunners, the Rowntrees, the Raphaels, the Isaacs, the Samuels, the Montagus, the Monds, the Levers, the Liptons, the De Forests, the Speyers, the Meyers, and all the various organs they may openly or privily control.

The Tame Cat

Mr. Snowden's amendment expressed regret that in view of "the existing industrial and social conditions of large masses of the people arising from a deplorable insufficiency of wages, which has persisted notwithstanding the sustained prosperity as reflected in the statistics of Trade and Employment and a great expansion of national

wealth, conditions which have been aggravated by a considerable increase in the cost of living," the Speech from the Throne made no mention of legislation to secure a minimum living wage or the nationalisation of land, railways, mines, and other monopolies. While, as we have said, the Labour Party as a whole presents the appearance of a Coalition "tame cat," individual Members are unwearying in proclaiming their independence, though it must be said that it generally peters out before any Division in which the fate of our Marconi Ministry is at stake. Mr. Snowden admitted that his proposals were drastic and far-reaching and might even be deemed "an impossible task in the Session, which is already considerably curtailed at the commencement." Speaking "on behalf of the Labour Party," his answer to such criticisms was, in the first place, "that we accept no responsibility for the legislative programme which the Government have thought fit to submit to the House. We are here to seize every opportunity to bring on the attention of the House what we think is the most urgent and pressing of all questions, that is, the poverty condition of a large part of our people. We have been sent here for that purpose, and we should be unworthy of the confidence of our constituents if we were willing to admit that any Session of Parliament should pass without making some large contribution to the treatment of the social problem." To the eyes of bewildered onlookers Mr. Snowden's observations are a vote of censure on the past and present policy of the Labour Party, of which, at any rate for this occasion, he was the avowed spokesman. As we have suggested, the Labour Party, so far from consecrating their lives to the problems of the poor, have subordinated everything to the business of keeping in office a Government for whose political programme they repudiate all responsibility. What use are such measures as the Parliament Act, Home Rule, or Welsh Disestablishment to the men who have sent the Labour Party to Parliament? and what serious efforts have the Labour Party made to prevent the parliamentary machine from being monopolised in manufacturing these measures, which are not intended to do anybody any good, but merely to gratify certain social animosities and to place the country under the heels of an autocracy financed by Radical plutocrats, many of them of alien origin? What do the gentlemen from Germany or Austria or Switzerland care about the well-being of the British

working classes so long as they are able to make colossal fortunes and secure the titles for which Radical plutocrats are at all times prepared to sell their souls?

Alternative to Parliament

WHY does the Labour Party tolerate a programme it condemns? Why does it support the enemies of its own class? It is all very well for Mr. Snowden to tell us that he and his friends "are not responsible for our present parliamentary procedure and present parliamentary machinery." They are responsible, because on a hundred occasions the Labour Party has held the balance of political power in the House of Commons, and was therefore in a position to bring such pressure to bear as Governments rarely resist. It is not open to them to represent the House of Commons as controlled by classes to which they do not belong simply because they have missed or mis-used their opportunities. According to Mr. Snowden, "the session which has just concluded was, I believe, the longest on record, and the output of legislation one of the most meagre. I think it is perfectly obvious to everybody that the present parliamentary machinery is not competent to deal with the work which the country expects Parliament to do." Every year new functions were being imposed upon Parliament and new demands made upon it, but the machinery, being out of date, was unequal to perform them.

I anticipate that very serious and lamentable results are going to follow from this inability of Parliament to satisfy those demands. The failure of Parliament to meet those demands is, I am afraid, bringing representative government and representative institutions into disrepute, and that can only have one result. If the people lose faith in Parliament, they will turn to other methods to try to remedy their grievances and to improve their conditions, and if Parliament fails, then the country will be given over to a condition of anarchy. I, as one who is a Constitutionalist before all else, will deplore deeply such a result as that.

There are plenty of people at the present day who are prepared to "deplore" this, that, or the other, but the question is, what are the deplorers doing to remedy what they "deplore"? We may ask, what have the Labour Party done to make the parliamentary machine more efficient for the purposes which they profess to have at heart? So far as we know, the principal social reform with which they are identified and for which they

must be held largely responsible is the payment of Members of Parliament. That is a poor record with which to go before an outraged and poverty-stricken people, who have had this further burden cast upon them by their own friends. In a curious passage Mr. Snowden himself referred, by way of contrasting the state of the poor with the expenditure of the well-to-do, to a newspaper statement "that members of this House spent last session £8000 upon wines. Taking the number at 400, that works out at something like 10s. per week—double the sum that two million of families in this country can afford to spend on food." The arithmetic is perhaps somewhat hazy, for if the speaker means to suggest that only 400 Members of Parliament drink wine we cannot follow him.

Life of "Swank"

What would be even more interesting were the figures available would be a comparison of the amount of the House of Commons wine bill before and after the payment of members—likewise the cigar consumption during those different periods. Labour members are very fond of bringing direct questions home to other portions of the community, but considering that they are indistinguishable in nine cases out of ten from ordinary Radicals, it would be interesting to know whether they set as bad an example as in many cases Radicals undoubtedly do. It is a notorious fact and is a matter of general comment at the present time, if any comment unsupported by sworn affidavits be permissible, that one distinguishing trait of the Radical politician, especially of prominent Radical politicians, is that in a homely phrase, "he does himself devilish well." He leads a life of "swank." Passing to the terms of the amendment, Mr. Snowden referred to the "almost unparalleled trade prosperity," which was greater than we had enjoyed for nearly fifty years. As the *Westminster Gazette* talks of little else, we are quite prepared to accept the fact, though we fancy that even on figures other countries have enjoyed even more unparalleled trade prosperity. Mr. Snowden's point, however, was "that the advantages of this trade boom, of this great increase in the amount of wealth which is being produced, are not being generally shared, and that the advantages are going to a relatively small number of our people,

and that those by whose labour this wealth is mainly created are reaping practically nothing of the increased fruits of their labour."

The speaker admitted that the condition of the working people to-day, deplorable as it was, could not be improved under existing economic conditions. To that we entirely agree, though we may be thinking of different things.

Wages

As he said, "If it is not possible for the wage-earners to get advances in wages and other improvements in their conditions at a time when the figures of unemployment have touched the lowest point, and when in many of our great industries there is a demand for labour that cannot be supplied—if it is not possible for organised labour and for the wage-earners to wring a higher remuneration for their labour under such unusually favourable conditions to them, then it is not possible that they can do so under what I describe as existing economic conditions." According to the latest figures in England and Wales alone, "nearly seven hundred thousand persons on any one day are in receipt of Poor Law relief. That means that in the last year, 1912 . . . a year when the figures of our foreign trade showed an increase of nearly one hundred millions sterling over the figures of the previous year, we had something like, and certainly not less than three million persons, different persons, who at one time or another had to apply for Poor Law relief." Then again, look at the housing accommodation of the people, of whom not less than one-fourth lived under conditions "described officially as overcrowding. As a result of those bad housing conditions we have a death-rate amongst the poor which is from two to four times higher than the death-rate among the well-to-do." In his own borough of Blackburn, a typical industrial town, the death-rate of children in the poorest ward was three or four times greater than the death-rate among the better-off part of the population; while budgets taken in different parts of the country showed that wages were too small to enable parents to buy milk for their young children. Board of Trade figures showed that 32 per cent. of adult men were in receipt of wages of less than 25s. per week. The speaker incidentally exploded the Lancashire legend of which we hear so much, to the effect that the working men are so prodigiously prosperous that they won't allow the ark of the

covenant—Cobdenism—to be tampered with. "Take the greatest of our manufacturing industries, the cotton trade, a well-organised trade, where Trade Unionism has almost become a tradition, and what do we find there? 'We find that in that well-organised and relatively well-paid trade 21 per cent. of the adult labour for full time earn less than £1 a week, and that in that same trade 48 per cent. of the adult men were in receipt of wages for full-time work of less than 25s. per week." Twenty-two per cent. of the general labourers earned less than £1 a week and more than 50 per cent. of them were in receipt of wages of less than 25s. a week. It was in contrast to this that Mr. Snowden made his illuminating observation concerning the consumption of wine by our democratic House of Commons.

Strikes

But besides being a boom year, last year was a time of grave industrial unrest. According to the Board of Trade the aggregate increase of wages was £7,000,000, but in the course of that year forty million working days were lost by strikes. Taking the average wage at 4s. a day, this meant a loss of wages of £8,000,000. Then there was the burden on the Trade Union funds; so we have on the one side of the account a gain in wages of £7,000,000, and on the other side of the account a loss in wages of £8,000,000, while Mr. Snowden estimated "they probably spent not far less from Trade Union and other sources." On the same calculation during the past ten years £18,000,000 had been lost in strikes with the object of raising wages. "Wages have risen slightly during the past few years, but they are practically to-day where they were twelve or thirteen years ago." That was not all, for while nominal wages remained practically the same, their purchasing power had declined. The Board of Trade had supplied figures upon the increase of prices of articles in common use during the last five years, comparing the prices of 1907 with those of 1912. On fifteen selected articles which should enter into every working man's family budget the speaker found that there had been an average increase of 29 per cent. If coal were added there would be an average increase of 34 per cent. "Wages have remained at practically the same, but the purchasing power of the labourer's pound a week is 34 per cent. less as compared with five years ago. It is worth only something

like 14s." Were they not justified, with such facts before them, in dwelling on the "deplorable insufficiency of wages" and in pointing out that large masses of his Majesty's subjects had no share whatever in the general trade prosperity. Mr. Snowden also called attention to another suggestive fact. The figures were confined to our foreign trade and showed an increase of £100,000,000 last year over the preceding year, but there were no comparative figures as to our home trade. "The Leader of the Opposition stated the other day, and I think he was quite right, that the volume and the value of our home trade are very much larger than the volume and the value of our foreign trade." From this the speaker drew the inference that he was safe in affirming that there would be a much larger increase than a hundred million pounds available for distribution produced last year.

Home Trade

But is this a safe inference in the face of the manifest decline in the purchasing power of our people? The foreign trade has increased through the prosperity of Protectionist communities, which is so great that they have been compelled to buy largely from us as home production in certain lines could not keep pace with home consumption. Moreover, there has been a great export of capital from this country—not a very healthy indication, even though it may have taken the form of a temporary boom in the export of goods. We, on the other hand, are surely suffering from under-consumption owing to stagnant wages and increased prices, so the normal analogy of the home and foreign trade may not hold good. Mr. Snowden enquired as to where all our prosperity had gone as so little of it had reached the working classes, and he answered himself by saying that "it went to a few people." Curiosity might be satisfied by reference to the financial newspapers or the financial pages of ordinary daily papers. One textile firm had last week announced a dividend of 50 per cent. and placed nearly £250,000 to its reserve funds, while the *Daily Mail* had stated that the figures of certain Lancashire cotton-spinning concerns showed an average profit in 1912 twenty times more than in the preceding year. On this we would ask our readers a plain question: When working men hear such statements, read such statements and know them to be correct, is it surprising that they should murmur?

During a "period of prosperity" there has been no appreciable increase in their own wages, but profits in much-advertised cotton concerns are twenty times what they were! We live in an age of advertisement and only big things are talked about; nothing is said of the innumerable struggling businesses in which sleepless efforts are made that both ends may meet and full employment may be continued, wages and salaries maintained. They have no knowledge of the burden which the Insurance Act, for example, casts on large and small employers, coupled with innumerable other impositions which have grown of late years, which have made the management of many concerns almost impossible, though their reputation depends on keeping up appearances and on pretending to share the prosperity which has gone to the privileged few who are not the Tory dukes or feudal squires who fill the lurid imaginations of Labour members, but Radical billionaires who are making money hand over fist while their employees remain precisely where they were.

Labour Mandarins

Mr. Snowden recited the prodigious returns in many industries (largely controlled by gentlemen who now belong to the Lloyd George nobility) and were securing dividends of 25 to 50 per cent. and piling up huge reserves. "For what purpose are they being piled up? What is going to be the position of the wage-earning class when trade declines? They are making no reserves. Within a fortnight of the beginning of a period of bad trade you will have the returns of pauperism increasing; there will be processions of unemployed in your streets; the cry of the hungry will be heard throughout the land, and the employers will have these huge reserves in order to fight the working people and to compel them to submit to a reduction of wages." Yes, and among those whom the people will turn and rend will not only be political charlatans of the Lloyd George and Churchill type, who have tomahawked their way to place and power by exploiting for their own political and personal purposes the exasperation of less fortunate sections of the community than themselves, but likewise the Labour Party, who during the period of prosperity were content to say ditto to the Radical plutocracy who controlled, inspired, and financed a Coalition Government of

Tee-the-liners—who consented to attach themselves to the chariot wheels of opulent Cobdenites many of whom made fortunes out of various forms of Protection while preaching Free Trade for other people. *It will be no defence in those days that occasionally* a Snowden or a Barnes, a Ramsay MacDonald or a Keir Hardie, uplifted his voice in Parliament and, when there was not the faintest chance of his views being listened to or his proposals accepted, called attention to the truly deplorable condition in which great masses of our people pass their lives. Mr. Snowden is a professed Constitutionalist who would deplore the substitution of anarchy for Parliament; but if the truth may be told, of all the disappointments which the poor, the real poor, the non-political poor, have suffered in our time, none has been more bitter than the total failure of the Labour Party to make their needs effectively known, coupled as it has been by an unholy and unnatural combination between Trade Union Mandarins and the Radical Party, to prevent social questions from being properly ventilated and dealt with by Parliament lest hard-fisted Radical millionaires might find the formation of trusts and combines more difficult than it is to-day, and lest Nonconformist malice should be baulked of its long-cherished ambition of levelling the Church with the dust and middle-class anarchists be robbed of the prospect of dismembering the United Kingdom.

Parliamentary "Slump"

NEEDLESS to say, Mr. Snowden got little or no change from the prosperous plutocrat at the head of the Board of Trade, who is sincerely convinced that nothing can be seriously amiss with any portion of the community so long as Mr. Sydney Buxton retains his present office. It was the kind of speech that is kept permanently on tap on the Treasury Bench to meet all conceivable contingencies. According to this great, wise and eminent statesman there had been an improvement in wages in recent years, unfortunately absorbed by the increased cost of living, but the phenomenon had been world-wide "and nothing had been done to aggravate it in this country." Misstatement of facts by his Majesty's Ministers are now so much the order of the day as to excite small attention, so perhaps it is hardly worth pointing out that this particular phenomenon of the absorption of increased wages by

increased prices is peculiar to this country, as the condition of Germany and the United States shows. It is due to Cobdenism, of which Mr. Buxton is a mainstay. The Debate on the Address was pronounced by experienced parliamentarians to be more lifeless than any within living memory, owing to the general satiety of politics and politicians. Lord Robert Cecil made a gallant effort to arouse a moribund assembly by a new topic. He moved an amendment calling for a reform of the procedure of the House of Commons, which he pointed out was rapidly losing prestige under the present régime. He quoted Mr. Asquith's declaration, which is fully worthy of Mr. Ure—the George Washington of the Government—at his best, "I think the country respects the House of Commons just as much as it ever did." Upon this Lord Robert Cecil observed: "I dare say that in the serene atmosphere of 10 Downing Street it may be true, but I cannot think that any one who looks at the matter quite impartially and who is doing his best to divest himself of all party questions can really say that the House of Commons as a house and as an institution, quite apart from what it is doing, occupies the same position in the country as it did twenty years ago." For one thing, Press reports of parliamentary proceedings were dwindling, and in more popular journals were frequently confined to an "imaginative summary" and "even the speeches of members of the Front Opposition Benches are commonly reported in a very perfunctory way," whereas if the same speech were delivered by the same man elsewhere it was often much better reported. In fact, the platform had become more important than Parliament. The attitude of the ordinary man to the House of Commons was "infinitely less respectful" than twenty or thirty years ago, "and I must say that if it was not so I should think less well of the intelligence of the ordinary person in the street and in the railway carriage." Parliamentary proceedings had become a solemn farce; earnest appeals were addressed to a House consisting of say twenty members, but when the Division came they were inundated by others whom nothing could induce to listen to their debates, and who voted simply and solely "because one vote would turn the Government out and another vote would keep the Government in office." The speaker concluded by proposing the extension of the system

of Grand Committees, a subject upon which we naturally have no knowledge. Even the Prime Minister, who never attempts to conceal his self-satisfaction while sneering at Lord Robert Cecil's "pulpit ideals which we are not always capable of realising under the hardy exigencies of daily life"—a singularly pertinent observation from the head of a Marconi Ministry—deemed discretion the better part of valour and suggested a Committee of Enquiry—the invariable remedy of "Wait and See."

Re-enter Marconi Mystery

At the very moment when politics appeared to be duller than ditchwater and even ardent Parliamentarians found it difficult to affect interest in their proceedings, there occurred one of those swift and complete transformations which prevent public life from permanently stagnating. The House of Commons suddenly found itself switched off dreary, dead-alive, exhausted discussions and plunged into a vital, palpitating controversy gathering interest day by day. In order to understand this surprising turn of the wheel it is necessary to refer to matters connected with this Review and its Editor, though we feel sure that our readers will believe us when we say that we have no desire to thrust either upon them, as the public issues now raised—which are what we care about—dwarf all personal questions, and it will be understood that if the present writer is constrained to obtrude himself it is only by way of illustration. When we last went to press the entire Coalition were breathing fire and slaughter against any abandoned individual so lost to all sense of decency and the respect due to the high-minded statesmen composing the Asquith Cabinet as to repeat the very positive and persistent rumours which have been current from last summer onwards (before the *Outlook* and *a fortiori* the *National Review* re erred to them) to the effect that certain Ministers had speculated in Marconi shares during the negotiations between the Post Office and the Marconi Company in connection with the Imperial Wireless System. *As our readers are fully aware*, the period of active negotiation, if we may take the Postmaster-General, who was conducting the negotiations on behalf of the Government, as the authority, lasted from about August 1911 to July 1912,

when the Contract was completed and signed, and only needed the ratification of the House of Commons, which was regarded as a matter of form. The Marconi question is treated at large elsewhere, firstly in the reprint of the full shorthand Report of the recent proceedings before Mr. Justice Darling, who heard the action for libel in which two Cabinet Ministers, Mr. Herbert Samuel the Postmaster-General, and Sir Rufus Isaacs the Attorney-General, were the plaintiffs, and the well-known French newspaper *Le Matin* was the defendant; and secondly, in an article written by the Editor entitled "Collapse of Cæsar's Wife," which follows the Report of the case. We need not recapitulate what all our readers have heard only too often, though if any of them were surprised at the seemingly disproportionate amount of space which the *National Review* has devoted to this question month by month since September, when Major Archer-Shee contributed an article which opened a good many eyes, we trust that our apparent aberration is now justified, because the Marconi mystery, to give it its proper name, manifestly raises the whole question of clean and wholesome government.

March or July?

A PRELIMINARY observation is necessary to avoid confusion, and it must be steadily borne in mind throughout this controversy, as it affords the key to the contrast between the previous attitude of the Government and the Coalition Press and their present attitude. Hitherto as we have said it had always been maintained by the Postmaster-General, on behalf of the Government, that he was abundantly justified in withholding information from Parliament concerning the Marconi Agreement of March 7, 1912, because there was no Contract, and in his own words not even an Agreement, and it would have been contrary to parliamentary precedent, of which he and his colleagues are inveterate slaves, to have given the House of Commons any information until the conditional acceptance of the tender in March became the completed Contract in July. Then, but not until then, in accordance with the canons of Ministerial propriety, was it his business to take the House of Commons and the country into his confidence and to allow them to know of the onerous obligations and the preposterous arrangement he had made

with the Marconi Company, of which Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the brother of Sir Rufus Isaacs, was the Managing Director and plenipotentiary. The Attorney-General, on the other hand, has for obvious reasons strenuously maintained that the question was settled in March, when the negotiations might be regarded as finished and the "Contract got." Of two things one, either the Contract was effectively completed on March 7—in which case the Postmaster-General deserves impeachment for his scandalous concealment of the fact from Parliament and for the gross prevarication with which he met all enquiries from both sides of the House for many months—or there was no Contract in March and, in any event, negotiations were continued until July between the various Departments concerned and the Marconi Company, which brings the all-important date of the Ministerial speculation in April into the "close season," and the conduct of Ministers involved—which in view of their denials in Parliament was anyhow scandalous—is as grave as though they had bought Marconi shares prior to March and were waiting to take their profit on the announcement of the Contract, which is the crude form in which they to-day prefer that the rumours concerning them should be framed. They demand to be described as "corrupt" because they are guilty of gross impropriety. Indeed, no language could be too strong to condemn their conduct. What could be worse than that Ministers, who had exerted and indeed exhausted themselves in giving the world in general and their own supporters in particular reason to believe that none of them had ever gambled in any Marconi shares whatsoever, have now been constrained to confess that this impression for which they were responsible is unfounded because as a matter of fact, as has been testified on oath by the Attorney-General, certain Ministers did participate in an unusually large gamble before the completion of the Contract on the Samuel theory, on the strength of inside information supplied to the Attorney-General by his brother Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director of the Marconi Company, at the time when on the Samuel theory the latter was negotiating with the Government. The fact that the speculation took place on the eve of a great jump in American Marconis known to insiders rather than on the eve of a great jump in British Marconis appears to us to be more or less

irrelevant, though if Coalition organs can extract any satisfaction from the distinction they are welcome to do so.

Coalition Rage

We may be prejudiced persons. The *National Review* has taken a very strong line on this question, but we think it will be found on a general review of our record that although the *National Review* may occasionally express strong views in strong language, it is studiously careful concerning matters of fact, as in the present instance. We have never accepted the doctrine that there is no smoke without fire because a few malicious people by putting their heads together could invent and propagate spiteful rumours against any person, public or private, whom they happened to dislike. But where the conduct of Ministers will hardly bear inspection from any point of view, and misleading repudiations are made in Parliament while suspicious secrecy is practised, and as a consequence rumours as to the conduct of Ministers become "extraordinarily prevalent" in the business world—which has hitherto been very charitable in its judgments of our public men—and when every enquiry that one can make leads to the same answer and the mention of the same names, we maintain that it becomes the public duty of responsible organs to call attention to the matter. To that duty we shall adhere despite histrionics about "personal honour" by politicians who give the lie to "rumour," while their pockets are stuffed with Marconi shares. The Marconi mystery is mysterious from every single point of view. It becomes more so every day. But we acknowledge to being only human and possibly we are prejudiced and therefore prefer that those most hostile to us shall state the issue and that Ministers shall stand or fall by that statement, which every one on their side would have admitted at the time to be a fair statement. It comes from the strongest opponent of every opinion with which the *National Review* is identified, and from a man who is acknowledged as representing the most stalwart section of the Radical Party—Mr. Massingham, the editor of the *Nation*. The *Daily News and Leader* had suggested, and indeed appeared to approve, that a warrant should be issued under the authority of the Speaker for the seizure of the private correspondence of the *National Review*, apparently on the

ground that feeling "runs very high in the Coalition." Its sister organ, the *Star*, declared that the Editor of the *National Review* ought to be in the dock for refusing to disclose the names of people who had mentioned the rumburs orally or verbally to him. The *Manchester Guardian* compared him to a man who had accused the King of committing bigamy. We need not weary the reader with quotations, though they could be adduced in abundance. The crime consisted in repeating the rumour that Ministers had speculated in Marconi shares.

"Ruining" the Government

It was at this point (*Daily News and Leader*, February 17) that Mr. Massingham, the Editor of the *Nation*, in a spirit of sweet reasonableness in an article written it must be admitted without any trace of personal vindictiveness, marked out the obvious duty of the present writer in well-nigh irresistibly persuasive terms. Mr. Massingham opened by stating the grievance, namely, that neither the Editor of the *Outlook* nor the Editor of the *National Review*, nor Mr. Lawson had ever said fair and square "on such and such a day of such a week such and such a Minister under such and such a name bought so many Marconi shares for so much and then sold them at such and such a price." The terms of the grievance should be carefully noted. Mr. Massingham added:

> All that was said was that some unnamed people in city offices, or tap-rooms, or club armchairs had said so, and that they knew that some one had told them that they knew a man round the corner who was a clerk in the broker's office who negotiated the shares. But that was not enough Everybody who wanted to believe these things believed them. The clubs rang with them, and ring with them still. The rich man's hatred of a great people's Minister winged the lies and doubly distilled the poison. Proofs! What proofs did the Duchess of Darlington want to convince her that Mr. Lloyd George was the devil's favourite child? . . . Mr. Maxse never did anything but hint. And for his particular clientèle he did not want to do anything else. But when all this mud-slinging is transferred from the newspaper office to the Committee Room the atmosphere is changed. Parliament is the High Court of Parliament, and Parliament can call for evidence and demand the production of persons.

Then came the exhortation to "prove or withdraw" followed by an appeal. "Now, if, as I think, Mr. Maxse has a conscience he will do this (*i.e.* prove or withdraw). He has made a great mistake and initiated a style of journalism unworthy of his talent

and his natural disposition. He may be right to shelter others, for whose idle tongues he has stood credit, but he must go into the thick of the storm himself. Otherwise we shall all know what to think." This leads to the point or, rather, the boomerang of Mr. Massingham's article in the *Daily News and Leader* (published, be it remembered, nearly a month before the *Matin* case), as he goes on to say, "*For if he* (Mr. Maxse) *substantiates any one point of his real though disguised case he has ruined the Government.*" Other Radical journalists who had been as completely hoodwinked by Ministers as Mr. Massingham, and whose diatribes were so frenzied that they produced an impression of honest fanaticism, have now adopted the Jesuitical attitude, which is perhaps the chief characteristic of the *Westminster Gazette*, even though its controlling influence may be Sir Alfred Moritz Mond, by endeavouring to establish an unbridgeable gulf between the British Marconi Company and the American Marconi Company. Now Mr. Massingham, from whom we differ politically on every single question but who is not a Jesuit, declines to stoop to such casuistry and refuses to draw the distinction, with which many of his confrères are hugging themselves, between these intimately associated Companies.

The "Nation's" Candour

As we have seen in Mr. Massingham's article in the *Daily News and Leader* of February 17, he called upon the Editor of the *National Review* to state that on such and such a day such and such a Minister had bought so many Marconi shares for so much and sold them at such and such a price. He recognised that the Government would be "*ruined*" if one such transaction could be brought home to them. That Mr. Massingham did not confine his demand to evidence of speculation in the British Marconi Company is shown by the article in the *Nation* (March 22) after Sir Rufus Isaacs' confession in the *Matin* case. Mr. Massingham is the Editor of the *Nation* and is directly responsible for if he did not write this particular article, which, though quoted elsewhere, may be reproduced here as it so clearly defines the issue between people like ourselves who take a very serious view of the Ministerial Marconi speculations and the Hush-up Press and the Cabinet who are a law unto themselves. We repeat our regret at con-

tinually bringing in the name of the Editor of this Review, but after all he is "one of the villains of the piece." After somewhat pathetically emphasising the fact that Sir Rufus Isaacs, Mr. Lloyd George, and the Master of Elibank had all lost money on their American Marconi transaction, the *Nation* continues:

In commenting on these disclosures, we feel bound to say that, in common with the rest of the public, we were under the impression that the charges or suggestions of Ministerial dealings in any shares associated with the various Marconi Companies had been disposed of by Sir Rufus Isaacs' statement in the House of Commons on October 11.* It appears that we were wrong and Mr. Maxse was right in concluding that the Attorney-General's denial had reference simply to dealings in the shares of the parent Company (with which the Government's contract was made) under the circumstances implying corruption. . . . Sir Rufus Isaacs confined himself to repelling this capital accusation. But we are bound to offer the comment that the public gave his denial a wider range and understood it to falsify the mass of gossip which attributed *any* participation by *any* Ministers in *any* Marconi undertaking.

We must add in parenthesis that we can hardly recall any single instance of any member of our omniscient profession admitting that he was wrong and that somebody who differed from him was right; and putting the personal question aside, this action of the *Nation*, which has been as sincere in its partisanship as we are in ours, is creditable to our common profession. The Editor of the *Nation*, as we have seen, had declared in the *Daily News and Leader* of February 17, that the Government would be "ruined" if any Marconi transaction could be brought home to a Minister, and the article in the *Nation* of March 22 proves that, like all honest controversialists, the writer meant a speculation in any Marconi Company. The sudden American boom was in some respects worse than the British boom. We cannot resist the conclusion that it was promoted by the indecent exploitation of the Attorney-General's disastrous telegram to the Marconi banquet in New York.

"Matin" Case

RECENT revelations caused all the greater shock to the Coalition because the undefended action of Sir Rufus Isaacs and Mr. Herbert Samuel against *Le Matin* (of which we publish a fuller report than has yet appeared) had been tremendously "boomed" in anticipation by the entire Ministerial Press which predicted that our

* The text of these declarations will be found in the article entitled "Collapse of Cæsar's Wi e."

spotless and stainless Ministers who had been suffering martyrdom for many months owing to the circulation of wicked rumours about Marconi speculations would at last have an opportunity of vindicating themselves by establishing the truth and destroying the forces of darkness which had endeavoured from pure malice to poison their noble reputations. Such commentators forgot that at almost any time during the last five months any of them could have insisted on being heard on oath by the Marconi Committee. Moreover, although *Le Matin* was defenceless, as indeed any one would be who published such an idiotic libel, the prestige of Ministers would be immensely enhanced by the fact that they were to be represented by Sir Edward Carson and Mr. F. E. Smith—whose conduct in accepting such retainers is keenly criticised outside legal circles, though doubtless it was in accordance with the laws of the Medes and Persians to which lawyers are alleged to be compelled to conform. To prevent misunderstanding we feel reluctantly bound to add what is said at greater length elsewhere, that the case of the plaintiffs was so presented in court, doubtless in all good faith, as to convey the utterly erroneous impression that the Editor of the *National Review* had uttered the absurdities which the London correspondent of *Le Matin* had put into his mouth. However, that is a minor matter, and we need not say that we bear no ill-will whatsoever to our French contemporary for the gross and palpable blunder of which it was the victim. The main thing is that the *Matin* case produced the very thing Mr. Massingham demanded in the shape of the confession—in view of what he had previously said, this seems to us the appropriate word—of Sir Rufus Isaacs, the Attorney-General, that he had purchased on the advice of his brother, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director of the Marconi Company, a large block of shares in the American Marconi Company. The subject was skilfully introduced by Sir Edward Carson after he had broken a butterfly on a wheel in disposing of the *Matin* libel, as though it was not of the least importance. "Although what I have said up to this entirely completes the matter as regards the proof of the falsehood of these statements, I must, my Lord, having regard to one transaction in one of the Companies by the Attorney-General which it is necessary to explain, ask an indulgence,

although it is a little outside the libel; so that there may be no confusion in reference to the matter in stating something about these other Companies (*i.e.* Marconi Companies)." Sir Edward Carson airily added, "Six weeks after the tender (*i.e.* of March 7) had been made public, the Attorney-General having heard of this American Company and of their shares—having heard of it, I think, for the first time a few days before—bought ten thousand of these shares at a premium which was the market price."

The Confession

WHEN Sir Rufus Isaacs went into the witness-box, where, of course, there could be no cross-examination, after disposing of the silly statements of *Le Matin*, he described his deal, and again we would refer our readers to the full Report. He bought 10,000 American Marconi shares on April 17, emphasising the fact that at that time British Marconis were at their highest point. Of these shares he sold at the same price, *i.e.* "a premium," at which he bought, though that price was not mentioned in this action, any more than the name of the seller, 1000 to Mr. Lloyd George, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, and 1000 to the Master of Elibank, then Chief Whip of the great historic Liberal Party. Sir Rufus Isaacs sold another 1750, and still holds 6400 of his original purchase, the net result being that he had lost about £1100 or £1200, as prices now stand, on the entire transaction. Radicals seek to console themselves by the fact that Ministers lost instead of gaining by the transaction, as though they had invested for the sake of loss. All that was stated in court was that the shares had been bought at a premium at the "market rate" on April 17, which instantly provoked the rejoinder from the City that American Marconis were only "introduced" on April 19, and that consequently the Ministerial block must have been purchased on inside information at a presumably lower price than the ordinary public paid, and on our own account we have been at pains to verify the fact that the chief Marconi jobbers were already quoting over £3 for ordinary customers on April 18, while they were offering small bundles of shares to favoured ones on the same date at £1 10s.—a difference of £2 between the price for the privileged and the price for the public which it was calculated was the very least

sum Sir Rufus Isaacs and his friends should have made if they did not make £3, because on April 19, £4 was bid, when the Ministerial holding was consequently worth £40,000. There was much speculation as to the precise nature of the transaction as details were lacking in the disclosures before Mr. Justice Darling. No words of ours could adequately describe the consternation caused outside City circles by the admission of Sir Rufus Isaacs and no special pleading by the *Westminster Gazette* or boycott by the Hush-up Press could repress the immense public interest in a transaction which every self-respecting man instantly recognised as touching the vitals of our public life. Our readers will not be in the least surprised. They were fully prepared for the revelations and will only ask themselves What Next?

Mr. Bonar Law

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Bonar Law, in no party spirit but as one of the responsible custodians of parliamentary honour, at the earliest possible moment asked the callous cynic at the head of the Government whether he proposed to make any statement on *Le Matin* case, and doubtless encouraged by the attitude of the Hush-up Press, Mr. Asquith affected a surprise that any statement should be expected of him. Mr. Bonar Law expressed surprise at Mr. Asquith's surprise and announced his intention of repeating the question immediately after the Easter adjournment. Meantime the Marconi Committee, which had shown few signs of activity, realised that something must be done. The public were deeply moved, and in private Liberal politicians did not mince their words at the conduct of Ministers in misleading Parliament and the country, though doubtless the Radicals will ultimately decide to make what we called in the last number "the fight for clean government," a strictly party issue. We wish them joy of it. We go to press in the midst of excitement and, as we have said, these pages may be out of date before they are printed. The policy of the Hush-up Press, which is largely in the hands of Hebrews who are laying the foundations of an irresistible anti-Semitic movement, sought to divert attention from the delinquencies of Ministers to "the exhumation of a country gentleman" and other kindred topics; great credit is due to the *Morning Post*, the *Daily Express*, the

Globe, and the *Financial News*, to mention only London papers, for their determined stand against the boycott. It should, however, be said, in justice to the *Times*, which published a lamentable article on the *Matin* case, that its Editor was abroad on a well-earned holiday. At such a crisis we look to our leading journal to do its duty on such an issue without fear or favour. That Ministers will be brought to book there can be no shadow of doubt, and that the Press will ultimately fall into line with public opinion is inevitable. The sensation was increased by a reference in the *Times* Political Notes to the rumour among Liberal Members—that Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister, was aware of his colleagues' dealings in Marconi shares before the Debate on October 11, and sat by and allowed them to make the speeches which have covered them and the Government with disgrace and dishonour. This is not a malicious Tory invention, because it is stated as a positive fact by *Reynolds' Newspaper* (March 23), of which the Managing Director was recently created a Privy Councillor by the present Prime Minister, of whom we can believe almost anything, so we are not in the least surprised to hear as we go to press that Mr. Asquith, as the head of the Ministry of Mendacity, knew all about his colleagues' speculations last July or August, probably at the very time the *Outlook* embarked on its public-spirited campaign. The frantic efforts of Ministers to hustle the Marconi Agreement through the House of Commons last summer virtually undiscussed is now fully explained, while the Master of Elibank's surprising withdrawal from Parliament becomes intelligible. Mr. Asquith and all his colleagues must now go before the Marconi Committee. It looks as though the Radical "Panama" had arrived.

Ministers and the Marconi Committee

SIR RUFUS ISAACS' evidence before the Marconi Committee (March 25), which at last decided to summon Ministers after an unconscionable and disastrous delay, against which we have protested for several months, naturally comes too late to be dealt with as it deserves here, and a full analysis of Ministerial evidence must stand over to next month. We can only say that once more truth has proved stranger than fiction, for rarely has a more astonishing incident been described than that narrated

by the Attorney-General, and we are not in the least surprised that Radical papers—and not only Radical papers—are scamping this testimony. Most of the Jews who are powerful in journalism, finance and other unexpected places, appear to be mobilised in defence of the Chosen Race, and a perilous *imperium in imperio* is disclosing itself to the public. The story told to the Committee filled up lacunæ left in the Attorney-General's evidence before Mr. Justice Darling. Very briefly, so far as we can make out, it amounts to this. That on April 9, 1912, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, just returned from New York, the Managing Director of the Marconi Company and the reorganiser of the American Marconi Company, advised Sir Rufus Isaacs to take 10,000 shares in the latter, which he could then have secured at about a pound. The Attorney-General refused, as he did not wish to deal directly with the Managing Director of the Marconi Company owing to its relations with the British Government. But a few days later, on April 17, Sir Rufus Isaacs allowed himself to be persuaded by another brother, Mr. Harry Isaacs—who had meanwhile obtained 50,000 shares from Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, who was engaged in "placing" 500,000 American Marconi shares—to buy 10,000 at the price of £2. Of these Mr. Lloyd George, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, took 1000, and the Master of Elibank (then Chief Whip of the Radical Party) took another 1000 at the same price, namely £2, but no money has ever passed between the colleagues, and Sir Rufus Isaacs, who still holds these shares, is now owed a small deficit by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Master of Elibank. Of the rest he holds 6400 to-day, having sold at a profit the Ministerial share of 3570 in some pooling arrangement with Mr. Harry Isaacs. There seems to be a net loss of about £1300 on the entire transaction at present prices. To laymen the affair is not yet very clear, though doubtless by the time these pages are in print it will be clearer, and possibly other revelations are in store. The outstanding fact is, that the Attorney-General acted on inside information supplied by one brother, the Managing Director of the Marconi Company, and although he did not deal with that brother, but with another brother, the shares were part of those for the placing of which Mr. Godfrey Isaacs had made himself responsible. Though not bought at ground-floor

prices, they were bought at first-floor prices, as only the day after the transaction the common or garden public had the utmost difficulty in getting American Marconis at £3 5s. In other words, the Attorney-General received valuable consideration via the Managing Director of the Marconi Company at a time when that Company was negotiating with the British Government for the completion of the Imperial Wireless Contract—according to the reiterated assertions of the Postmaster-General who on that ground alone defended a silence which was otherwise indefensible—and, what is equally serious, the Chief Whip of the Party, upon whose good offices and skill parliamentary ratification might depend, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the custodian of the public purse, shared in that valuable consideration. The fact that they lost on a transaction on which *ex hypothesi* they meant to gain is as utterly irrelevant as other flimsy excuses which are being put forward in Coalition and Hebrew quarters for transactions quite unparalleled in our parliamentary annals when you take into account the speeches that were made with the knowledge and approval of the Prime Minister on October 11, 1912, who was fully apprised of his colleagues' speculations. Our readers will understand that the article entitled "The Collapse of Cæsar's Wife," having to be passed for press before the editorial notes, was written before Sir Rufus Isaacs began giving evidence at the Marconi Committee just as these pages must go to press before the conclusion of his evidence.

Elementary Questions

MANY questions will arise on the conclusion of the Ministerial evidence before the Marconi Committee. One conundrum that requires probing is the indecent attempt of the Postmaster-General last summer to hustle the Marconi Contract through the House of Commons before the adjournment in August without serious discussion. At the time it was thought that Ministers realised that they had made a preposterous arrangement with the Marconi Company which would not survive serious discussion, and for that reason they desired to employ the resources of the Coalition to secure ratification without debate. But to-day their conduct bears a very different and infinitely worse complexion, because the portentous fact has been extracted from the Prime Minister

and from the Postmaster-General that both were aware that their colleagues had been speculating in one of the Marconi companies. Discussion would have been dangerous, and delay was dangerous. It is not unreasonable in the light of these additional revelations to infer that this knowledge was the dominant consideration in the evident anxiety of the Postmaster-General to prevent the House of Commons from debating a contract which was withheld from Parliament until July, although the Attorney-General is never tired of telling us that it was for all practical purposes concluded in March. We are also entitled to know why the Marconi Committee so long delayed summoning Ministers to give evidence, seeing that we are told that Ministers have been panting to testify during five weary months; again, What written evidence exists of Ministerial eagerness? Also were any members of the Marconi Committee aware of the American gamble while they were engaged in browbeating witnesses about "rumours"? And why did Ministers suddenly find it necessary to take action against *Le Matin*, and drag in—on their own showing—an innocent and irrelevant transaction in American Marconis. Were they afraid that this preciously guarded secret might be disclosed elsewhere?

Fraternal Generosity

WE have had the advantage of seeing an early proof of a shrewd note in the *Outlook*, the journal to which the public is immensely indebted for its courageous campaign against the Marconi Agreement. As our contemporary observes:

Sir Rufus' evidence shows that he behaved with extraordinary generosity to his brothers. We hope that Mr. Harry Isaacs appreciates the delicacy of the Attorney-General which prompted him to strain at the gnat and refuse to buy shares at £1¼ from Managing Director Godfrey while he swallowed the camel by using Mr. Godfrey's private information to buy at £2 a share from lucky Mr. Harry, although shares were still available the day following his purchase for certain selected persons in the City at from 25s. to 30s. Sir Rufus then sold through his own broker eight thousand shares, but explained that owing to a pooling arrangement only 3570 of these sales were for the benefit of the Ministerial trio (whose present holding therefore still shows a loss of over 5s. a share), while the rest were to be credited to the more fortunate Mr. Harry.

This would have been a most natural arrangement had the brothers bought at the same price, but before the pooling operation came into force Mr. Harry had already made £9000 by selling to Sir Rufus. Even among brothers we should have thought it only reasonable to pool sales if purchases had previously been pooled also. For one partner in the pool to start with his shares at half-price, and for the sales of the other

them to be restricted to his further advantage, is a remarkable if rather one-sided instance of brotherly love. Even if the Chancellor of the Exchequer has so far omitted to pay for his shares, it seems a little hard that he should have been deprived of his legitimate profit by such a self-sacrificing family arrangement.

The latest number of the *Stockbroker* contains equally pungent comment.

I do not think we should be too hard upon these Cabinet Ministers. Sir Rufus Isaacs is a lawyer, Mr. Lloyd George is a lawyer. Everybody knows that solicitors and barristers are very bad business men. The Law Guarantee scandal is proof positive. When Sir Rufus Isaacs and Mr. Lloyd George spoke in the House of Commons on October 11 they had no doubt completely forgotten the little deal in American Marconis. Besides, they had made a loss, and no one cares to remember losses. . . . . As Sir Edward Carson has pointed out, the American company could have no interest in the contract. Only three members of the English Marconi were on the Board. The public muddle up these things. They will not differentiate betwen English, Canadian, American, or Spanish. They see gambles initiated in all more or less simultaneously, and they hear the same story about all. But the legal mind is acute enough to disintegrate the interests. It would consider a gamble in English Marconis horrible, one in American praiseworthy; and possibly if any Minister had ever dabbled in Canadians he would have been judged worthy of the K.C.M.G. The exquisite elasticity of the legal mind has compelled Great Britain to fill her Cabinet with lawyers. No other class of man can see so clearly. But as I have said, elastic as is the legal mind it lacks the business instinct. As a result Sir Rufus Isaacs has made a loss of £1000 to £1200 on the deal. He has our sincere sympathies. He also stands as a warning to all punters who refuse to take a profit, for undoubtedly he could have made a large fortune had he sold at the top.

The Tariff Reform League

ANNUAL meetings of political associations are usually somewhat dreary affairs, being a combination of Sunday School and picnic. A large number of walking delegates, representing few persons except themselves, assemble between substantial meals for the purpose of voting cut and dried resolutions manipulated from the platform, while any manifestation of independence in the body of the hall is promptly suppressed "amid universal applause." Very different was the Annual Conference of the Tariff Reform League held this year at the Caxton Hall on March 14, and the various other gatherings in connection with it. Mr. Austen Chamberlain was conspicuous by his manly, vigorous, straightforward speeches, reaffirming the principles of the League, and making the best that could be made of the so-called Edinburgh compromise. Not his least striking utterance was delivered at a smoking concert the night before the Conference, which he believed to be a private

function where he might unbosom himself without any anxiety on the score of reporters, but happily, unbeknown to the speaker, reporters were present, and thus a very salutary warning to the Unionist Party in general and to Free Fooders in particular not to trifle with Tariff Reform became common property. Lord Selborne sent a letter to the Chairman of the Conference (Lord Duncannon) expressing his concurrence with a motion in favour of the full policy of Tariff Reform as set forth in a resolution of Mr. Chaplin adding that it should be made plain

> that the Tariff Reform League attaches no less importance to the reconstruction and revivification of rural life in the United Kingdom. We intend through Tariff Reform to benefit the agricultural labourer no less than the artisan, the agriculturist no less than the manufacturer. The rural community must no more be sacrificed to the urban than the urban to the rural It will be the duty of the Unionist Party to strike the fair balance between them. It seems to me that the snare of all political parties at the present moment is the excessive and dangerous importance attached to tactics. There is really only one sure way by which any political party can gain or retain the confidence of the nation, and that is to have definite principles and to stick to them. Do not let us arrive at our convictions lightly, but deliberately; then let us so master the arguments on which they are based that we can make plain to our fellow countrymen the reasons for the faith which is in us and let us not spare ourselves in doing so. Above all, let us remember that the greatest of all political virtues is courage.

We have read nothing better or more stimulating than this letter of Lord Selborne for a long time, and we trust that the proper steps are being taken to popularise his admirable advice.

Where We Were

MR. CHAPLIN, true to his character, made a fearless and uncompromising speech, and Mr. George Wyndham coupled an eloquent tribute to Mr. Chamberlain, who signalised his splendid enthusiasm for the cause by handing over the magnificent sum of 114,821 shillings which had been collected for his Birthday Fund, with a stirring appeal to Tariff Reformers to stick to their principles. The arguments for Imperial Preference were overwhelming, and it was their duty to educate their countrymen to realise that they were right and their opponents wrong. No one advocating a half-hearted policy would even have got a hearing at the Conference, to which the most notable contributions were the staunch and stalwart speeches of representative working men from Lancashire and Yorkshire who did not hesitate to describe the recent whittling

down of Unionist policy as "a betrayal" which was disastrous from every point of view. That the Tariff Reform League would have nothing to do with political tactics was made manifest by the drastic *resolutions that were passed*, and although as a matter of form and out of consideration to the Front Bench members of the League—not that any one of them exercised the faintest pressure in the matter—the motion of Mr. Hicks, regretting "the decision of the Unionist Party to postpone the rearrangement of Food Taxes and the policy of Colonial Preference" was withdrawn as being a direct vote of censure, resolutions of substantially the same character were unanimously carried, *inter alia* the following: "That the rank and file of the Tariff Reform League adhere to the full policy of Tariff Reform as advocated by their leaders since 1903, and would regard any departure from it as equally disastrous to the cause of Tariff Reform as to the interests of the Unionist Party." The mover of this resolution referred to the recent deplorable scuttle on the Food Duties as having originated in Manchester or Liverpool, and thereafter spreading to London. Lancashire working men present indignantly repudiated the suggestion that any working men in any part of Lancashire had any hand in it, and Manchester was expressly exonerated, though it appeared to be recognised that "somebody in Liverpool did something." It would be interesting to know who did what, and also whether there was any connection between the suspiciously simultaneous demonstrations of Little England newspapers in Liverpool and London.

Mr. Chamberlain's Letter

Our readers we feel sure will be interested to have before them the text of the letter in which Mr. Chamberlain conveyed his magnificent present to the Tariff Reform League, to be devoted to the cause so near his heart. It must be some consolation to him that in an age of scuttle the Tariff Reform League stands precisely where it did and advocates the whole policy, as has been made clear by the statement issued by Lord Duncannon.

Villa Victoria, Cannes.
March 7, 1913.

My dear Wyndham,—I beg you to accept for yourself and to convey to your committee and the subscribers to the Birthday Fund my cordial thanks for their gift and for the kindly feelings which prompted it. I have seen some of the letters received

from subscribers, many of them from working men, and have been told of many others. I have been deeply touched on personal grounds by these messages of friendship which have come from all parts of the British Empire. They also show how widespread is the sympathy with the Imperial cause. I propose, therefore, to present this gift to the Tariff Reform League, with the request that they will use it as may seem best to them, for the promotion of Imperial Preference and Tariff Reform.

It was not given to me to complete the work which I had begun in connection with this policy, but I am greatly encouraged by the zeal and activity of those who have continued it. Much has already been achieved. The cause of Imperial unity is making rapid strides. The action of Canada marks a great forward step in the common organisation of defence—but it still remains for us to take the next step by the common organisation of trade through the establishment of mutual Preferences between all parts of the Empire. Till this organisation is complete in both respects we shall have—to use the words of Adam Smith—not an Empire, but the project of an Empire only. To convert that project into a reality is the aim of those who have contributed to the Birthday Fund, and it is to carry out this object that I ask you to hand the cheque on my behalf to Sir Alexander Henderson as treasurer of the Tariff Reform League.

I am, yours sincerely,

J. Chamberlain.

Kendal and Durham

Much interest was aroused by the by-election at Kendal, where a vacancy was caused by the regrettable death of the Unionist Member, Sir Josceline Bagot. The Radicals had great hopes of capturing the seat. There happened to be living in the constituency a man of exceptional personal popularity—the kind of man who whatever his views can carry almost any seat. He was amiable, honest, disinterested, without any axe to grind. His popularity was exclusively due to his personality, deriving no adventitious assistance from great wealth or great position. It would be discreditable to the neighbours of such a man as Colonel Weston were he not popular and did they not wish to send him to Parliament when the occasion arose. The one public question on which he was keen was National Service. When the local Unionist Executive met to select a candidate they had fixed on Major Argles, a well-known Tariff Reformer, but there is alleged to have been a spontaneous movement at the meeting in favour of the nomination of Colonel Weston, who happens to be a Free Trader, but was not acclaimed on that score, but simply and solely because he is Colonel Weston. He was adopted in lieu of Major Argles. The officials of the Unionist Party were naturally placed in a serious dilemma by the unforeseen action of the local Executive,

as it is obviously impossible for any Party to acquiesce in the selection of a candidate who rejects the "first constructive work" of the Party, and wouldn't even come up to what is known as the Edinburgh compromise. There is no room nowadays for a Conservative Cobdenite. As Colonel Weston does not believe in Tariff Reform we respect him for refusing to give in a nominal adhesion under official pressure, though official pressure was rightly applied, as otherwise we should relapse into our former condition of a congeries of warring atoms. Official support was accordingly withdrawn, and Colonel Weston finally stood as an Independent Unionist unidentified with any Party, and as a consequence the country enjoyed the advantage of at last having an election in which the foremost plank of one of the candidates was National Service, even though Lord Roberts' programme was watered down locally. That compulsory service was regarded as a main issue, is abundantly clear from the ferocious circular issued to the electorate on the eve of the poll by Mr. Somervell, the Radical candidate, in which "the conscription bogey" was run for all it was worth, and a good deal more as the event proved. The declaration of the poll was awaited with immense and conflicting interest, and much surprise was caused outside Westmoreland, where Colonel Weston's extraordinary popularity was not appreciated, by his triumphant return by the large majority of 581.

Colonel J. W. Weston (Ind U.)	3261
Mr. W. H. Somervell (L.) . . .	2680
Ind. U. Majority	581

On the same day the result of the Durham by-election, Houghton-le-Spring, where there was a three-cornered contest, was announced, the result being substantially "as you were," but the Radical, as no Radical paper pointed out, was returned by a minority vote, the Ministerial nominee, Mr. T. Wing, only polling 6930, while the Unionist, Mr. Richardson, and the Labour candidate, Alderman House—the anti-Government candidates—between them polled 8972. In such a constituency, if anywhere, the Unionist should have scored by the scuttle on the food duties, but there is no trace of any such development.

WHAT IS WRONG?

We are all agreed that something is wrong—the Church is being disendowed, the United Kingdom broken up, every ship that leaves England is laden with emigrants escaping from poverty, while every penny saved is being invested if not for the benefit of the foreigner at any rate not for the benefit of the Englishman who lives in England. No one knows what will happen next; politics have indeed become almost humorous; the blows of the Government have descended on those who least expected them. The professional classes for instance, yes, even Conservatives, showed rather a tendency to wish that the millionaires should get a kick or two from democracy. It would do them no harm, they thought, and cure them of being purse-proud; but when Mr. Lloyd George was raiding, he did not raid the millionaire but suddenly turned the direction of his foray and descended on the Doctors—carried off anyhow their independence and left them spluttering with rage. And again, the small middle-class tradesman, brought up in the narrow faith of political Nonconformity, piously hoped that everybody richer than himself would be made to suffer; but the regulations of the Shop Act and the pleasure of sticking on a fourpenny stamp has convinced him that Mr. Lloyd George on the raid is a distinctly unpleasant person even for his political supporters, and it is fun to notice the change of expression on their countenances; a little time ago they were jubilant, like boys at a fair, when the clown makes another look foolish; now it is their turn to look foolish and they cannot quite see the joke.

At any rate all those with anything to lose are convinced that something is wrong, and we are perhaps for that reason in danger. Indeed, one is almost more frightened of the Radical measures that the Conservatives may now produce in their anxiety to induce

the electorate to get rid of Mr. Lloyd George, than of the genuine article.

What then is wrong? If you go to the Clubs you will gather that a demon in human form in the person of Mr. Lloyd George has driven a lot of defenceless gentlemen as sheep to the shearing yard, and now, disregarding their cries, is engaged in despoiling them of their wool. But if you go down a line of cottages you will not indeed find that Mr. Lloyd George is popular; but what you will find is, that everybody is more or less convinced that the rich are against the poor and that if the poor do not quit themselves like Englishmen they will soon be reduced to slavery and that therefore they are wiser to accept any alliance so long as the ally is against the gentry. They like Mr. Lloyd George because the rich people hate him. When for instance a vituperating Duke writes to say that he will dismiss a number of his servants or withdraw his subscriptions from some worthy charity under the dim idea that Mr. Lloyd George or his supporters are sharers in the charity or are personal friends of his servants, that letter is read with attention by the working men and they come to the conclusion that they must vote for Mr. Lloyd George because millionaires and rich men hate him. If Dukes would only write expressions of love and affection about Mr. Lloyd George, we might expect that he would become a very unpopular character; but if they will persist in painting him as the arch-enemy of all rich men, in the present state of mind of the working man he is sure to be popular. No, what is wrong is that we have tumbled into a class war; the real cause of the war is that the working classes have been treated very unfairly, though not by the Conservative Party, and have had their wages universally reduced by the diminished purchasing power of money. Now when they are sore with this reduction they are met by Unionists exhibiting such a combination of honesty and stupidity, that one feels they must always be saying over to themselves, it is better to be good than to be clever.

Political candidates appear often to forget the point of view of the cottager; to him it seems that while his income is falling, that of the richer class is increasing. Rich people seem to have plenty of money: the money they leave is published every week in the papers, besides which every picture paper gives portraits of rich people

enjoying themselves. Sometimes they are rushing down snowy slopes, sometimes dressing in fancy dresses; sometimes surrounded by Church dignitaries, they are opening fêtes and bazaars; sometimes standing on one leg and grinning, they have been caught by the photographer as they leave a fashionable wedding. Everywhere the poor man sees signs of the rich man's comfort, the dust of his motor car does not allow him to forget it. All this would be tolerable if the poor man were growing richer, but as he is growing poorer it naturally hurts and produces ill-feeling, especially as it is accompanied by a lessening of contact between rich and poor. Every big industrial concern tends to separate the two classes; the men in the works never see the master, and their wives certainly do not see his wife. The two bodies of human beings only meet in the heat and strife of industry. Can you wonder that the working man is ready for war? If we are to save the situation we must do something to get rid of this warlike spirit, for the end of a class war is like all war—not so much the victory of one party as the exhaustion of both. When capital and labour have both left England and when we have lost religion, Empire, prosperity, we shall no doubt learn wisdom. Cannot we do it before that day, have not we suffered long enough to realise the importance of making for peace?

Nothing perhaps will promote peace better than for masters to try to understand what is the real grievance of the working class and what is the real character of the man who supports labour agitation. Well, first and foremost, the working man is a Tory, an unutterable stick-in-the-mud Tory; he does not believe in and never has desired new-fangled things, but his one grievance is that the purchasing power of his wages has been diminished, so though he may be paid the same amount of money, he is in reality poorer, and all the talk about his desiring better houses, better conditions, is of secondary importance in his estimation; what he definitely wants is more money. Normally this attitude would have told very heavily against the political party in power; the working man would have attended various political meetings, he would have listened with a certain amount of shrewd common sense to the glowing pictures that the political candidate drew of the golden age which was to follow closely the date of his return to Parliament, he would have remembered this picture and

while his wife discoursed to him on the price of bacon and the extortionate claims of the coal man, he would have compared the prophecy with the reality and have come to the conclusion that he was not much better off with "'this 'ere Lloyd George." Normally therefore one thing would be certain, and that would be the return of the Conservative Government at an early date. What is abnormal is that the Conservative Party are held responsible for the fall of wages, though they have not been in power, and to elucidate this phenomenon I think we must seek for some explanation beyond the tactless behaviour of Conservative candidates and the misrepresentations of their adversaries.

I think we can find the explanation in a growing estrangement between the classes that comes first from the enormous size of commercial undertakings, secondly, from the erroneous business maxim which limits the relations between employer and employed to the buying and selling of labour. The old spirit of interdependence between employer and employed has disappeared with the individual employer; the Limited Company that has taken his place has no finer or indeed other feelings; it is essentially a machine, a machine for making shareholders rich; it has no love or mercy, no gratitude or generosity, and is therefore most antipathetic to a class which is peculiarly sensitive and might even be called sentimental. The working man wants sympathy; in all things he likes the personal note, and so a Company is an abomination to him; he likes a man, preferably a just, honourable, true man, but he will tolerate a cursing, swearing, ill-tempered man; he will explain, "I take no heed to what he says when he gets blackguarding." But a Company is such a cold thing, its formal letters give him the stomach ache; they are as insolent and unfeeling as those of a Government Department; and when he looks at one of these official communications his heart fails him; he is referred to Rule No. so-and-so, and no exception can be made in his case. Silenced but not convinced he naturally falls a prey to the Socialist agitator. If some one would only explain the matter to him, even if they blamed him, he would like it better. With this sense of the want of sympathy comes the sense of defencelessness. This official world in black coats, with big headings to its paper, descends on him and takes his money from him,

money that he knows he ought to have; and there is nobody but the Trade Union Leader who will help him, so, feeling friendless and helpless, he goes to him and swears fealty! The Trade Union Leader is now his real master and he will ride behind his master's banner and he will not care what the quarrel is but will hit hard and fight hard, caring a great deal less about his own interests than about doing harm to his adversary; and when this is his state of mind a class fight is inevitable. The working man goes about looking for it and he generally has not very far to go because most employers seem singularly maladroit.

Take for instance the late trouble on the North Eastern Railway; one supposes that the North Eastern Directors knew that there was bad feeling among their men; they certainly knew that the men as a whole thought that one of their mates had been unfairly treated in the police court. Yet instead of saying, "the man is our servant, we will see him righted" and taking his side, they take the side of the magistrate and the policeman against the feeling of their men and, with an affectation of principle worthy only of the bureaucrat of France, they say: "We cannot expose the travelling public to any risks." Obviously the men were in greater danger than any of the travelling public, and equally obviously the Directors would inevitably be humiliated, as indeed they were, and the result is that the engine-driver has been restored, but that a strike is still almost inevitable sooner or later. Another example of the ill-feeling that exists between employer and employed has been shown on the Midland Railway. The phenomenon was really the same, there is the same bitter feeling between the Company and their servants, a bitter feeling which may culminate in a strike and injure both at any moment. Not only so, but Mr. Lloyd George or any other agitator can use this feeling as the motive power to destroy the Church or the Empire, or religious education, or anything else; all he has to say is that it hurts the rich, the black-coated gentleman upstairs, the mysterious and greedy shareholder behind him; once the railway man is persuaded of this he will support him. I would earnestly suggest that English working men have no sympathy with Radical measures as such; they support them because their allies care for them and they regard them as half-bricks to heave at the heads of rich men. The working man

voting Radical is a Tory, but a Tory who hates the rich. I think this diagnosis is important to establish, because if it is correct it will prevent our young Conservatives yielding to any insidious suggestion of the need for a political programme. Ask any working man what he wants altered, you will find he only wants more money; suggest to him that it is most desirable to send the House of Commons to study the South Pole and leave England to work hard and make money and enjoy football matches, and he will cordially agree. If you want to make him angry, tell him how a rich man has dismissed a poor man and you will see the fighting look come over his countenance at once. This contrast between indifference and interest should convince us that we do not want Radical legislation from Conservative benches, but we do want a better feeling between the classes.

A great deal of the bitterness of feeling might be allayed if employers would only study the welfare of their men with the same care that they study the convenience of their customers. A certain Railway Company with whose servants I have frequent dealings, is a just and fair employer and should be accounted such by every just and impartial judge, but every man who works for it hates it. It has no sympathy for its men; it buys their labour from them and that is its sole relation with them. A good number are killed on the line. The Company as a rule expresses its sympathy with the widow by asking when she can vacate her house and stopping the pay of the deceased from the moment he was cut to bits by the express. I have known these men twenty-five years; some very few have been of bad character, the majority of them are of the very highest character and some are perfect saints. These latter must have conferred an incalculable benefit on the Company by raising the tone of honesty, industry, and carefulness among their fellow workers, but the Railway is absolutely indifferent; whether the man is a saint or a sinner, if he has not put into a superannuation fund he may go to the workhouse when he is worn out, and if you apply to the Company and point out fifty years of service without a bad mark, they will merely refer you to their regulations and leave you to get other people to maintain out of charity those who have served them so well. And this Company is not peculiar; the policy of all great commercial concerns is similar.

Why cannot employers take a different line, why cannot Railways say, for instance, "Men who wear our uniform are under our protection"? Not only should they behave justly and fairly to their servants, but they should see that others do the same. When their men grow old they should try and make posts for them, and if they cannot they should appeal to their shareholders and ask for contributions for necessitous cases. They might encourage thrift in a sympathetic way. It might be made extremely easy for a man to buy stock and become a shareholder, even if no co-partnership scheme were possible. Not only should they make it their business to house their men properly, but considering the number of fatal accidents they have every year, they might provide cheap houses for widows. Besides which they might go outside their railway, they might approach the leading shops and places of entertainment and get special terms for their men, and instead of letting their men go to a general hospital, have one of their own. Then they might have a defence fund, subscribed to by the men, but contributed to by the Directors and shareholders, and they should fight the men's battles with all their weight. If landlords in any district habitually overcharged their men, they could remonstrate; if they continued to overcharge, they might threaten to build in competition which would probably produce a reduction of rent. All these and many other things they could do if they cared to do it. Ah! but I hear my economical friends say, where is all the money coming from? In the first place none of these things I have mentioned need cost very much money, some none at all; but even if they did cost money, we must set against it three considerations. In the first place, the Company would be strike-free, it would recapture the loyalty of its men; in the second place, it would get better measure of work from its servants, they would protect the railway in every way they could; thirdly, the Directors would be independent of the House of Commons, in fact the House of Commons would be their servant. When the leader of the Railway group called on the Prime Minister, his argument would be short and effective, "If we do not get this or that measure passed, all the constituencies in which our men form a large proportion will be transferred to the other side." I think if the account on both sides were

done out fairly, the Directors would find they were buying shillings with sixpences. What employers of labour have got to realise is that the position is critical; if they prefer war and determine to beat down the men, they will have a hard fight, and both will probably be ruined before the fight is over; but if they prefer peace, they must establish a personal relation with their men, they must go into their works and attend with punctuality and thought to every detail of the men's lives with the same care that they bestow on the public or on their machines; and by such means they will easily raise up amongst their men a spirit of personal loyalty.

Merely from a business point of view, of course, this would be wise. The cost of strikes and insurance against strikes and much else might be saved. But there are higher ideals, ideals which make peace and good feeling worth getting at any price. For after all, whether we are in business or whether we are not, whether we are employers or employed, we are citizens of a mighty Empire which has nourished and protected us, and not only us but millions upon millions of defenceless races who enjoy liberty and safety because our flag flies over them. If through our internal dissensions, if through this miserable bickering between capital and labour our Empire be destroyed, great will be the responsibility of any who through love of gain or carelessness have allowed such dissensions to exist. It is useless to belabour the disloyal or time-serving politician with abuse. Vituperation can never build up an Empire, the existence of such politicians is neither a peculiar feature of our age nor one of its chief dangers. These have always existed in every age, in every country. What constitutes the danger of to-day is that now they obtain credit where before they were treated with contempt; the people of England follow them rather than the patriot or honourable statesman, and the reason that people behave with such unwisdom and folly as to give power to men who may destroy the Empire for an electioneering intrigue is because the industrial classes distrust if they do not hate their employers.

When the country has been brought to this pass, it is useless talking of money or of the cost of reforms. When England is destroyed what will be the capital value of the undertakings in whose pretended interests she has been sacrificed? One of

the first principles of all English business men should be to carry on their business so as to bring honour and glory to England. It may seem at times that it is right for her sake to lose money, for after all it is right at times to give our very lives for our country, but as a whole it will not be so. Much good feeling can be established between masters and men by consideration that costs trouble rather than money. The same mental acumen, the same skill of organisation which has built up the great commercial interests of England, can, if applied, build up in a short time the good feeling between master and man. Individually each Director of a Company is possibly a sympathetic and kind-hearted man, giving largely in charity and caring for the welfare of his fellow man, but the present business maxims of England disregard in the most unbusinesslike way the first necessities for business success, namely, loyal labour and national security. Both these will result from treating working men in a sympathetic and kindly spirit; the frequent strikes, the power of the agitator, are the natural result of a class bitterness engendered by bad business maxims.

When Companies recognise that they have men working for them who have souls and are living sentient beings, not "hands," the prosperity and peace of England will only be excelled by the contentment and efficiency of our industrial population.

William Gascoyne-Cecil.

OUR PERIL FROM ABOVE

I

Are so many of us indifferent, still, because we do not understand? Do we realise, from what we read in the daily Press, that a foreign Power—and a Power, regarded as a potential enemy—has perfected an aircraft which will fly, at the speed of an express train, for several days and nights without alighting? Do we realise that this machine—evolved at immense cost, and after years of patient labour—is at last a practical war-craft with a powerful, duplicate engine-plant, a crew of specially trained navigators, and an installation of wireless telegraphy which will flash a message several hundred miles? Do we realise that such aircraft, if launched against us with hostile intent, could steal across the North Sea, at night, and rain down tons of incendiary and explosive bombs upon vital points of our coast-line, and on London itself? Do we realise that, even after ceaseless warning, we lie practically defenceless against this peril, which grows from day to day?

To bring the danger home to the mind of a non-technical reader; to explain what modern-type airships can accomplish; above all, to show how we should perfect a special type of aircraft to protect our shores—are the aims with which this article is written.

First, as to the aircraft which is our menace. What is known as the rigid type of airship—a machine, that is to say, with a rigidly built hull—has been developed by Germany, to its present state of efficiency, by carefully organised effort, and a liberal expenditure upon practical research. A frequent cause of disaster, with early airships of large size, was the inability of their crews to control them, when they were being manœuvred near the ground in gusty winds, at the beginning or end of a flight; while another risk of accident lay in an adverse weather change, during

a flight, which might necessitate a descent, perhaps upon unsuitable ground, at some distance from the airship's shed. These were primary difficulties, needing to be surmounted before definite progress could be made. Germany overcame them by the diligent training of men—not only in controlling aircraft when in flight, but in every detail of their manipulation when upon the ground—and by the construction of sheds, at many points throughout the country, so that harbours might be available, should a pilot run for shelter before a freshening wind.

Such facilities were essential—the more important of the two being the patient drilling of men to accustom themselves to the exigencies of the new service. The chief factor, indeed, in the success achieved by Germany with rigid-type airships, is the precision with which these huge craft are now handled, not only in the air, but when being towed in and out of their sheds. Here, apart from any question of the possession of apparatus, lies the power of the German Air Corps. In their early form, large rigid-type airships were condemned; but the disasters which overtook them were not brought about by faultiness in the principle involved. They were due to man's clumsiness, and to attempting spectacular flights, before such were justified. Germany, from the first, favoured airships of very large size, undaunted by the difficulties—to say nothing of the expense—entailed by their development. To-day, after strenuous effort, with which the name of Count Zeppelin is so honourably associated, the German Air Corps is provided with a type of craft which has a rigid hull more than 500 ft. in length, a gas capacity of over 700,000 cubic ft., an ability to raise a weight of nearly thirty tons, and a power of averaging a speed of forty miles an hour for twelve hours on end, and of remaining in the air, if need be, for seventy hours. Furthermore—and here is a vital point—the organisation of the German air service is so efficient, and the experience gained in ceaseless experiment so valuable, that flights may now be made, even in defiance of wind and weather, on eighty per cent. of the days of the year.

Such results have been achieved logically; there have been no discoveries of a revolutionary kind. Where other countries abandoned the right form of airship hull, owing to technical drawbacks, Count Zeppelin—with the weight of War Department

and public behind him—laboured to remedy these defects, regardless of time, trouble, or expense. In contrasting rigid and non-rigid airships, from a non-technical standpoint, all that need be said is this: for vessels of moderate proportions, a non-rigid gas-containing envelope, of rubber-proofed fabric, is found suitable; but, with craft of great size, the use of such a non-rigid envelope presents drawbacks—chiefly in regard to maintaining its shape, and when attempting to propel it at high speed. The rigid type offers to the air an unyielding hull, which is built with extreme lightness from a framework of aluminium, or light metal alloy, sheathed with fabric, and with the necessary gas-envelopes contained within it.

If an involuntary descent, in a gale of wind, and on exposed ground, has to be made with a non-rigid dirigible, the envelope may be deflated, and the craft suffers—as a rule—only slight damage; but, with a rigid airship, there is no short cut to safety. In such circumstances, the machine would probably be wrecked. But for lifting heavy loads, and in the ability of its rigid hull to be thrust through the air at high speed, what is known as the Zeppelin-type airship presents definite advantages—particularly from a military and naval standpoint. No half-hearted policy, however, is possible with such machines. They must be manœuvred with absolute precision, and they must have shelters—north, south, east, and west—to which they may run when assailed by a gale, or when suffering from temporary mechanical breakdown. Granted complete organisation, a rigid airship fleet may be operated with success. Without such organisation, disaster is inevitable. Not only in training crews, and in building costly sheds, but in a laborious improvement of apparatus, has Germany revealed her patient zeal. The motive-plant of the modern Zeppelin airship, fitted in units developing a total of 500 horse-power, has attained a reliability which would have been considered almost impossible a few years ago. In speed, too, which is vital when combating adverse winds, the capabilities of German rigid airships have been strikingly improved. Whereas thirty-five miles an hour represented a maximum with early-type machines, the recent productions of the Zeppelin factories—in which, by the way, hundreds of highly skilled craftsmen are now employed—may be accelerated to a speed of fifty miles an

here. The moral of the German success, with the rigid-type airship, is this: no unlooked-for development has taken place, but the reward is being reaped of nearly twenty years' unremitting effort, maintained in face of every difficulty and discouragement. Had we displayed such enthusiasm, linked as it has been with carefully planned experiment, we might now possess the first of an adequate fleet of home-built airships, instead of being compelled to buy machines, from foreign firms, upon which we may begin to teach our men the rudiments of airmanship, as involved in handling really large, fast-flying craft. The rôle of the airship, as of the aeroplane, is primarily as a scout, co-operating either with an army or a fleet. As such, the medium-sized dirigibles which have been built by various nations will doubtless be employed; and so, too, will those huge, rigid machines, with which Germany is so deeply engrossed. But the latter type of craft has other potentialities; and one of these—a power which cannot be ignored—is as an engine of destruction.

II

Over-statements of a case, the exaggerations of a menace, are common faults nowadays. No sooner is a new terror perceived, than we proceed to tear it to shreds. So, in regard to this peril from above, the public has been asked to tremble with apprehension at highly coloured pictures of the horrors of an aerial invasion. Such hysterical warnings, when repeated again and again, and with a heightening of effect at each repetition, lose all useful purpose, and blunt an ordinary man's perception as to what actual danger there may be. This much can be said, without tub-thumping, or exaggeration: the German rigid airship, although it has not yet been used as a weapon of offence, would undoubtedly be so employed if war broke out; and, were a sufficiently large number of such machines available, and equipped for their work of destruction, they might be directed, with paralysing effect, against an enemy which found itself unprovided with adequate defence against them.

The strategical situation, as created by Germany's possession of such potentially destructive craft, may now be seen upon the Franco-German frontier. France, which views the emphatic success of the German rigid-type dirigible with apprehension,

is directly menaced, from across the frontier, by such important airship stations as have been established at Metz, Baden, Frankfort, Dusseldorf, and Cologne. As a counter-move, France is now paying renewed attention to her airship fleet, which is inferior to that of Germany, and is concentrating effort upon her frontier air-stations, notable among which, from a strategical aspect, are those at Verdun, Toul, Epinal, and Mézières. Many French experts would be content to pit aeroplanes alone against German airships; but the French military authorities are uneasy, and the official disposition, certainly—seeing that offence, as well as defence, is held in mind—is to match the new German dirigibles with craft which are equally powerful. So long as foreign airships remained comparatively unreliable and unwieldy and prone to harassing mishaps, the distance dividing their sheds and our shores made England's lack of initiative, in either construction or experiment, appear less inexcusable, to an ordinary view, than it really was. But, immediately the German rigid-type machine emerged as a reliable and long-range cruiser of the air, we began to foresee the penalty we should be called upon to pay for our official apathy and neglect, during critical years of aerial development. This penalty is sufficiently serious: it sets us the task of learning the A B C of the construction and manipulation of a formidable engine of war, in the use of which a powerful rival has already made itself proficient—and this at a time when effort should, presumably, be concentrated upon holding ourselves abreast of foreign armament.

If the powers of a German aircraft, stationed say on Heligoland, were limited to haunting the airways of the North Sea, or patrolling our shores with spying eyes and an efficient wireless system, the position would be sufficiently uncomfortable—seeing that we, in self-inflicted helplessness, could make no counter-move worthy of the name. But the situation is worse than this, as already suggested. The Zeppelin-type airship, with its capacity for weight-lifting, becomes more than a scout: it must be reckoned with, definitely, as a new and—when employed in sufficient numbers—extremely potent weapon of destruction. It may be assumed that the most powerful type of German dirigible could now undertake—not as a wild adventure, but as a reasonable cruise—a long-distance flight of thirty hours' dura-

tion. During that voyage, if weather conditions were not definitely adverse, the airship might fly 1000 miles; and it could be made to carry, even on a long flight like this, a dead weight of aerial missiles equalling several tons. This means that, if it began a flight, say, from the air stations at either Heligoland or Cologne, such an aircraft would be able to release her bombs over practically any point in England—either on the coast, or inland—which her commander might be directed to attack. Such a flight, it should be emphasised, would be distinctly within the capacity of the airship. But the fact should be borne in mind, nevertheless, that in the event of very adverse weather arising, while the craft was over foreign soil, she would be in a grave predicament. She could not alight, in the open, without risk of immediate disaster—to say nothing of capture, should she manage to escape a bad accident when landing. All she could do, indeed, would be to put her bow to the wind, and ride it out at whatever altitude her commander thought best; and, when the gale subsided, the vital question would be whether she had sufficient fuel remaining in her tanks to enable her to fly back to her station.

Such contingencies as these need citing, if only to counteract the impression, so often given in alarmist statements, that an aerial raid upon England could be carried out by an enemy without difficulty or danger to themselves. Such is not the case. Were a squadron of foreign airships called upon to attempt the long flight necessary in attacking our shores, without being permitted to wait for weather conditions which were perfectly favourable, it is fairly certain that an appreciable number would find themselves in difficulties—apart from any defensive action which we might be able to take. This, however, does not relieve us of the responsibility of protecting ourselves against a peril which will, quite inevitably, grow from year to year. The German airship service of to-day represents remarkable progress, both from the mechanical and purely human standpoint. But our present peril is trifling when we contrast it with the danger which will threaten when, instead of owning a few of the new and powerful rigid-type airships, Germany possesses a large and perfectly organised fleet of such destructive craft.

The cost of construction, in acquiring a number of such

vessels, does not represent a serious factor, when the expense entailed in providing any new form of armament is considered. Although precise figures are unobtainable, it is understood that the German Government is in a position to purchase a Zeppelin of the latest type for £30,000 or £35,000. This being so—and either of these figures appears reasonable—there is no financial obstacle to the creation of a large fleet of such craft. The building of sheds, the training of crews, and the general upkeep of a well-equipped airship service would, of course, entail considerable expense; but the outlay would be small when compared with the vast sums expended, without any question, upon naval armament. If airships are to be effective weapons of destruction, their use in fleets appears essential. Isolated attacks, carried out by one or two machines, could have no great significance in time of war. To strike a crushing blow, the concerted effort of many craft, handled by highly skilled crews, would be required. It is against the specific menace of the use of hostile aircraft in large numbers that England should be prepared. At present, it is true, we are in no dire peril from aerial invasion; it would be foolish to suggest that we are. But shall we be able to say the same in a year or so's time? The answer may be framed tersely: we shall not. Therefore, while looking to the future, we should act now—not in a half-hearted, motiveless way, but with shrewdness and decision, after weighing carefully what risks we shall actually run, and how they may be guarded against.

III

Bomb-dropping, from aircraft, has not been carried out, so far, in more than a perfunctory way. Ill-organised tests, in Tripoli and the Balkans, showed that men could be frightened, by small explosive missiles, and in some instances wounded, and an occasional building damaged. But haphazard effort produced indifferent results. In the future peril which England is called upon to face, however, it may be taken for granted that science—as applied to the manufacture of bombs, and the mechanism from which they may be discharged—will equip an airship fleet with a real potentiality for destruction. Given a perfected aircraft, with which to carry a load of bombs to the spot over which they may be released most effectually, the

provision of projectiles, and the sighting tubes through which they may be launched, is easily within the powers of those who strive to make war more terrible.

The problem, for England, is to find means of defence against aerial attack. A foreign move is being made—a move which threatens grave danger. It is for us to devise the counter-move. We are in no position, at the moment, to think of offensive tactics. We are definitely threatened; we must defend ourselves. Only when secure from aerial invasion may we consider, logically, any question of ourselves delivering an attack. The immediate problem, therefore, becomes this: how can we best protect our shores, and vital points inland, from assault by hostile aircraft? In the interests of brevity, we may reduce effective methods of defence to only two headings. The first, which seems likely to be most successful, is to meet the aerial invader in his own element, and give battle with specially armed craft. The second is to open fire upon him, from the earth, with high-angle guns. As to the efficacy of either, it must be admitted that we rely upon theory—actual data being as yet unavailable. But, in connection with other developments in armament, there is a similar lack of practical knowledge. A European war would, of course, settle many doubts; but it would be bad policy to wait for it, before devising means to resist aerial attack.

The greatest European experts, when discussing the tactics of war in the air, differ upon many points, but agree upon one. While the vulnerability of various machines is a moot point, and the most effective type of aerial gun remains a matter of doubt, it is conceded that speed in flight, and an ability to ascend rapidly, will be of vital importance to the fighting aircraft. Fast flying will be of special value to a machine when—just prior to an engagement—it is manœuvring for position. It may seek to circle above an antagonist, or perhaps dart in at him, open fire, and then speed out of range. However, seeing that no aerial duel has yet been fought, a discussion of the precise tactics to be employed can scarcely be profitable. This much, at any rate, is now regarded as reasonable prophecy: when a couple of aircraft, equally armed, and equally well-handled, meet in war, the speedier of the two should triumph.

A purely fighting air machine should be swift in flight, and

armed—apart from its bomb-dropping tube—with some light, long-range gun. But, although speed is the ideal, it must often be sacrificed to other requirements. A fighting machine, for instance, may be needed to raise heavy loads, and fly long distances before reaching its striking point; if so, the constructor must plan a big, weight-carrying machine, and be content with moderate speed. If an aircraft is required purely for defence, and is not called upon to fly long distances in order to gain the scene of action, its makers—in designing it—are free of the complications of excessive loads of fuel, and may concentrate upon speed, combined with armament. The situation may, perhaps, be made more clear. Germany, for example, in order to gain for her airships a wide radius of action, and an adequate destructive power when they reach their destination, must build large, comparatively slow-flying craft. But we, who look upon the matter from the point of view of defenders, and need efficient fighting machines with which to resist aerial invaders when they approach our shores, are dealing with a simpler problem. The defensive aircraft need not, for instance, be burdened with petrol for long flight. What it should be designed for, primarily, is to strike a rapid, decisive blow. Therefore, having no excessive weight in fuel to carry through the air, the machine may be perfected as a high-speed, essentially fighting craft; and it is to the construction of machines of this specialised type that England should devote attention. Only with our shores protected by a chain of such craft, are we entitled to plan other forms of armament. The prime consideration is that of defence; and the effective way to meet aerial invasion is to fight the enemy with armed machines speedier than his own.

With high speed vital, and duration of flight unessential, aeroplanes suggest themselves as suitable machines for purposes of defence. Although the airship has materially increased its speed, the aeroplane is still the faster craft, and is likely to remain so. Large, strongly built biplanes, carrying two men, and fuel for several hours' flying, attain speeds of more than seventy miles an hour; and it is reasonable to assume that, with the engines of higher horse-power now available, a specially built armed aeroplane, with its necessary crew, should be able to attain a speed of eighty miles an hour,

The latest Zeppelin-type airship is, as has been stated, capable of a maximum speed of fifty miles an hour. This may, in the near future, be increased, say, to sixty miles an hour. But beyond this, at any rate with existing methods of construction, airship speeds are not likely to go. Air resistance, when huge hulls are driven at high speed, is exceptionally great. Therefore, it may be argued that a defending aeroplane, when engaging an invading airship, should have quite twenty miles an hour the better of it, in the matter of speed; and such advantage promises to be all-important.

Another practical point, to the favour of aeroplanes, lies in the matter of cost. Whereas a large, rigid-type dirigible cannot, as mentioned, be acquired for less than £30,000 or £35,000, an efficient fighting aeroplane should be procurable for £2000—or even less, if a large number of such craft, of a standard type, are ordered at the same time. Many defending aeroplanes may, therefore, be provided for the cost of one attacking airship. Their use in large numbers would, indeed, be an essential feature of a scheme of defence.

It should be made clear, at this stage of our article, that we do not advocate, for England, a policy of neglecting the airship. To do so, when aerial armament is so experimental, would be illogical. But our point is this: for the specific purpose of defence against aerial invasion, in which fast-flying is obviously vital, the armed aeroplane presents itself as the most effective craft. As an instrument of retaliation, in a raid across Channel, or for detailed reconnoitring in the North Sea and elsewhere, the long-range airship has obvious advantages. So far as construction and equipment are concerned, it may be argued that the defensive aeroplane should be a powerfully engined biplane, with an ability to alight either upon land or water; that its gun, with an operator, should be placed in advance of the main-planes, with as free a range as possible for firing either above or below, or upon either side; and that the remaining members of the crew should be a pilot and engineer—the latter, in addition to his work upon the motor, to handle an installation of wireless telegraphy, and enable the machine to be scout as well as destroyer.

There are few difficulties in the way of producing such

machines. With motors at present available, craft of this type are, indeed, already being built. But their speed, in the majority of cases, does not exceed sixty or sixty-five miles an hour, and this scarcely gives them a sufficient margin, in the matter of pace, over their prospective enemy, the airship. The present-type aeroplane, of course, is by no means to be despised; but, for purely fighting purposes, and as a definite safeguard against invading aircraft, a speed very appreciably in excess of that of any foreign airship is desirable. That an eighty-mile-an-hour fighting aeroplane will soon be produced, as a practical craft, we need not doubt. Speeds even greater than this, for armed machines, are within the range of development. The matter is one of engine power, combined with constructional efficiency. Aeroplane motors of 160 and 200 horse-power are now, for the first time, procurable; and their application to specially designed fighting craft should be the first aim of our authorities. It is for us, indeed, to direct our chief efforts towards evolving one type of machine—as Germany has laboured with the rigid airship. She arms herself with huge, destructive aircraft, to use far afield. We, in our turn, should become supreme in the construction and handling of the aeroplane "destroyer"—swift, scientifically armed and manned by expert crews. Not until well-organised depots, of such defensive craft, are established round our shores, and placed, also, so that they protect vital points inland, should we concern ourselves with other phases of aerial development. Here, amid the chaos of advice and warning which has, to many minds, served only to obscure the real peril, is one concrete need: let us have aircraft with which we may defend ourselves.

IV

As an auxiliary to the use of fighting aeroplanes, in coast and inland defence, there is the specially constructed field-gun which —placed at points of strategic advantage—will discharge against hostile aircraft some form of shrapnel shell. In this regard, as in most other aspects of aerial warfare, theory must—in the absence of practical data—be relied upon. Tests that have been made, to indicate the vulnerability of aircraft to gunfire from the ground, have been confusing. Occasional successes of artillerymen, in the

Balkans, and of riflemen in Tripoli, were due mainly to the fact that the airmen they "winged" were flying injudiciously low. But it is reasonable to contend that, whereas aeroplanes present small and elusive marks, the airship which hovers over a chosen spot, in order to discharge its bombs, will provide the gunner with a far larger and more satisfactory target. Night attacks will, no doubt, be the airship's aim; but such will not always be feasible; and, at any rate, an expert artilleryman, aided by powerful searchlights, should render a good account of himself, even if a position is attacked, from above, under cloak of darkness.

Regarding the problem from our special point of view, as resisters of attack, it seems clear that a high-angle gun, designed to be used against aircraft, should be developed to a point of efficiency, and then placed so that it may augment the services of the armed aeroplane. The airship, with its great lifting capacity, may be able to armour itself partially; but its fragile hull must remain vulnerable. One well-placed shot would, probably, put a machine out of action. A gunner, therefore, has encouragement to perfect himself in this new form of marksmanship. There remains, of course, the keenly debated point as to what will happen, actually, when airship meets aeroplane in conflict. Imaginative writers have described breath-taking aerial duels, employing a wealth of vivid detail; but, from the sober point of view of technical accuracy, such anticipations appear—at any rate to War Departments—to be somewhat disappointing. We are, to be frank, once more building upon theory. Just what will take place, in that aerial strife which is to precede the future wars of Europe, either on land or sea, no man can say.

In the early days of the airship, when this craft was slow-flying, and sluggish to answer its controlling planes, aeroplane pilots spoke, with cheerful confidence, of how they would pass above the unwieldy monster, and destroy it with one well-aimed bomb, while its crew—having the huge envelope above them to block out their upward view—would be helpless to retaliate. But in the latest airship, of the type with which Germany is arming herself, this manœuvre could not be embarked upon with such light-hearted ease. Apart from the greater quickness in action which its speed gives it, this craft has a platform at the

top of its hull; and, upon this, mounted so that it may be fired directly upwards, is a machine-gun.

It is generally assumed that, in aerial combat, an immense advantage will lie with the machine which is able to rise above its adversary, and so be in a position to drop a bomb upon it. Under normal conditions, a powerfully engined aeroplane should ascend at a higher speed than an airship; but, by a wholesale discharge of her water-ballast, the latter craft could—in dire need—make a sudden rise at a pace greater than that of her enemy. The possibilities of war in the air are, indeed, confusing. Opponents may steer straight ahead, swing from side to side, or manœuvre up and down.

But an attacking aeroplane, apart from its superiority in the matter of speed, should offer a small and unsatisfactory mark for an airship's gun-fire, while the five hundred feet of the latter's hull should provide a fair target—even for a gunner in an aeroplane flying eighty miles an hour. The airship, it is true, may carry perhaps three guns to the aeroplane's one; but it is not to be assumed that a single aeroplane, armed with its one machine-gun, would prove a match for a powerful airship, equipped with several. It might, of course—adopting torpedo-boat tactics—rush courageously upon its bulky antagonist, and be sufficiently lucky to fire a telling shot. But, when sound tactics, in such engagements, come to be laid down, it will probably be found that two or three aeroplanes are detailed to attack one airship. Their task, should the need of the situation prove sufficiently urgent, will be to destroy or injure the monster at all costs. That they should, in most instances, be able to do so—although, probably, at grave peril to themselves—appears reasonably certain, normal factors of the encounter being given due weight. The element of luck would, of course, enter into the question—also the judgment of the respective pilots, in manœuvring for position, and the skill and coolness of the gunners, in taking instant advantage of opportunities.

Success in aerial fighting—more than in any other branch of the war service—must depend upon the selection and training of aircraft crews. In our Navy and Army, it has been proved already, we possess men who are eager, and admirably fitted both in nerve and courage, to undertake this perilous work.

So far as human material is concerned, we may rival the world. But the problem that has arisen must be handled promptly and logically, not in a hesitating, fumbling way. There is the menace; it must be met—not on paper, or in speeches, but in reality. We have men; we must have machines—not any type of aircraft, but the apparatus best designed for the work of defence. Crews must be trained to a state of proficiency in the handling of armed, high-speed craft. Until safe from peril, we should be specialists, focusing our energies upon the production of machines which fly faster, and fight better, than those of any rival.

Enthusiasm and money must be thrown into the work. We should not rest until we can produce fighting craft in our own factories, and in ample numbers, and man them with pilots and gunners who are experts; and we should see to it that our defensive fleet of aeroplanes is appreciably stronger, numerically and in armament, than that of a prospective enemy. It is an obvious task; it lies first to hand: but it has been neglected shamefully. And, even now, nothing is offered us, officially, but sporadic effort, backed by inadequate finance.

CLAUDE GRAHAME-WHITE.
HARRY HARPER.

THE TRUTH ABOUT WAR

It is useless to judge the problem of national defence merely by a comparison of our Navy and Army with those of other countries, or by drawing alarming pictures of the hostile designs of other nations. National security in a democratic country like ours depends first and foremost upon whether the mass of our people understand the elements of the problem of national defence. If they do, there is little doubt they will have the necessary patriotism to face the sacrifices that may be required. Our chief danger lies at present in the fact that the people are, owing to our system of party government, prevented from knowing the truth. The working classes have neither the time nor the opportunity, even if they have the necessary education, to discover what the real situation is, and unless those in authority in the Government take steps to enlighten them they must continue to remain in ignorance. It will thus be seen that our situation to-day demands a higher standard in our statesmen than has ever been required before. Unfortunately, instead of realising this, politicians of both Parties are far more concerned with playing on the ignorance or prejudices of their audiences than on enlightening them on national issues. Politics have become a profession in which the easiest way to advancement is the primary concern of those who adopt it. Professional men actuated by personal ambition, and especially lawyers, are becoming every year more prominent. Now, besides the fact that human nature being what it is it is impossible to expect such men not to adopt the shortest road to their own advancement, seeing that it is their means of livelihood, it must be remembered that lawyers are as a class peculiarly unfitted to put great national issues before the country in all their bearings. Their whole training is that of partisan warfare. Success in

their profession depends upon their ability to throw themselves heart and soul into a cause regardless of its merits and concerned only to make the best of it however bad. To gain this end the suppression of the truth, the raising of false issues, the concealment of facts, the browbeating of witnesses who reveal too much, and the playing on the emotions of juries who reason too little, are not only permitted but are essential to success. It is too much to ask that men whose career depends upon these qualities should abandon them on entering politics where they are equally effective.

And while the quality of our politicians has deteriorated the Party machine has become all-powerful. It is admitted on all hands that the independence of the House of Commons has vanished, while the power of the House of Lords has been destroyed. Both individually and collectively therefore our politicians and statesmen are more unfitted to deal with national questions than in former times, and this is infinitely more serious now when power lies in the hands of the masses, and when it is essential that they should be led by men of the highest character to whom Party advantage is as nothing compared with the national welfare. No one can look upon our history and doubt that in former great national emergencies our leading politicians were in the main men of far higher character and independence than those at present in power, nor that their task was easier in that the electorate was very limited in number, and there was not to the same extent the temptation to play upon their ignorance or prejudice.

These conditions are besides peculiar to this country. In others the question of national defence is not open to misrepresentation. Its requirements are known and discussed by the man in the street, popular works bearing on every phase of it are produced and eagerly read, while by the nature of their military systems the army is closely connected with the national life. No Ministry could endure for an hour that neglected any portion of its duty in this respect. In the summer of 1911, when a state of tension existed between France and Germany, a question was asked in the French Chamber as to the exercise of the supreme command of all the French armies in time of war. The reply was unsatisfactory. It appeared that the functions

of the supreme command, instead of being vested in one man, would be partly exercised by the Minister of War and partly by the Chief of the General Staff. There was an immediate crisis, the Government resigned, and a Commander-in-Chief was appointed who should have the supreme control in time of war. A defect in military organisation stirred the nation to its depths and made the further existence of the Ministry impossible.

Imagine a British Government resigning because the functions of a Commander-in-Chief in time of war had not been properly defined! The ignorance of the British people on the elements of military and naval warfare are so great that they will believe the wildest absurdities. It is no exaggeration to say that had either Lord Haldane or Colonel Seely addressed their speeches of the last few years to French or German audiences those nations would have been convulsed in laughter. Not only does an eminent lawyer and philosopher lecture a field marshal on strategy, but both our late Minister of War and his successor tell the people, not what war will require of them, but what they think they can get out of a particular system of enlistment. France had such men forty years ago and she has been in mourning ever since. The two following extracts from Parliamentary debates will exemplify what has been stated above both as to the lower standard of many leading politicians and as to the general ignorance of facts to be received without question.

House of Lords, February 10, 1913. *Lord Lansdowne:* Did not the noble Viscount reduce the strength of the home battalions?

Lord Haldane: Not a single home battalion was knocked off nor was their strength reduced.

House of Commons, July 12, 1906. *Mr. Haldane:* "We propose to begin with the reduction of the 3rd Scots Guards. . . . I may add here that we propose to reduce the Irish Guards, which is a battalion of colossal proportions, from 920 rank and file to 820. The infantry of the line establishment 805 non-commissioned officers and men, can well be reduced to 775, but one cannot go below that, otherwise one would not get the drafts."

These are our two greatest dangers. First that our leaders will not tell us the truth, second that the people, unlike those of the Continent, know so little of war themselves. But these evils are increased by a host of illusions, the result of false

sentiment or the misreading of history. They are fostered by politicians for their own ends. One illusion is the idea that sea-Power alone can defend an island nation like ourselves; another is the idea that our so-called voluntary system is peculiarly adapted to the independent character of Englishmen; another is the notion that we have "beaten the world" by this system, that we have shown superior fighting form to other nations, that the conditions of Continental warfare are such as we shall never have to meet, and that there is an indefinable something which enables us to muddle through our difficulties. Another and even more dangerous class of illusion is that which prevails on war in the abstract, that it is barbarous and wicked, and we should almost feel ashamed of the necessity of preparing for it. At the root of this conception lies the delusion that civilisation has advanced to such an extent that war will no longer be necessary for the solution of international differences, and that a gradual disarmament will inaugurate a reign of peace.

Is it possible that a nation cherishing these misconceptions and idle dreams can ever awake to the truth before it is too late? For the naked truth is exceedingly unpleasant and very galling to the national pride. It is difficult in the compass of an article to give a full picture of the real situation, but unless the elements of the problem are understood no remedy is possible.

Now, so far from there being more safeguards against warfare now than in former times, the exact opposite is the case. History shows that war has always been so terrible an evil that men have always striven to obtain some check or restraint upon it. In the Middle Ages this restraint was obtained by the authority of the Church. The Pope was the arbiter of Europe and could enforce his will upon recalcitrant States. As long as his authority was recognised no overthrow of the balance of power was possible. With the Reformation all is changed. The wars of religion reduce Europe to a state of chaos where the weakest go to the wall. Ever since then the only check upon a State which became too powerful has been the coalition of other States against it. This principle, known as that of "the balance of power," has been the foundation of every European treaty. Looking back over the last 400 years we see first the Empire of Germany under Charles V., then Spain under Philip II., then France for

two centuries occupy the strongest position in Europe, and each in turn is checked by a combination of other States against it. This prevails until 1870, when the German Empire is reared on the ruin of France, and a new danger to Europe gradually arises. But this new danger, although similar in character to former ones, is a far greater menace. For the last hundred years the principle of the balance of power has prevented war becoming general throughout Europe. Now any war involving any one of the Great Powers must become general, for Europe is divided into two great armed camps consisting of Russia, France and Great Britain on the one hand, and Germany, Austria and Italy on the other. The balance of power has hitherto meant the independence of the smaller countries such as Holland, Belgium, and Denmark. Without this there can be no balance. Success on the part of Germany is now incompatible with the independence of those nations. General Bernhardi repudiates the principle of the balance of power altogether for this very reason. Also, in former cases where there has been a general European conflagration the war lasted many years with varying fortunes to both sides. Recovery from temporary defeat and re-organisation of naval and military resources has been possible. These conditions are no longer applicable. With the enormous masses of modern war, defeat will mean irretrievable ruin. All the resources of the nation being employed, a prolonged war will mean the paralysis of the whole national life. Since the consequences of war are so terrible, the victorious nation will take measures to make recovery out of the question. The Germans would have done this after the Franco-German War had they not been prevented by the other Powers. After the next war there will be no neutral nations left to intervene. One combination or the other must be successful. It will thus be seen how far-reaching and terrible will be the next war in Europe, and how every safeguard and check upon its scope has been removed.

And now what does history teach us as to our part in European warfare? First we have always had to intervene to prevent the domination of the Continent by any one Power or group of Powers. We shall have to do so again. Those who shrink from the idea of an obligation to land troops on the Continent

and who, therefore, rejoice at the Prime Minister's assurance that no such obligation exists, should ask themselves, not—"Are we under an obligation to send troops?" but "What will our position be if France is crushed?" We have been on the whole successful, but this statement requires qualifying. In our greatest trial during the Great French War our record was one of failure for many years. Our Army was so inadequate and our statesmen so blind that it was unable to affect the issue at the outbreak of war. Europe combined against France and was beaten, the failure being largely due to us. The balance of power being overthrown the war continued for twenty-three years. Our Fleet was powerless to bring it to a close. It continued for nearly ten years after our signal victory at Trafalgar. Our Army was only able to land very small numbers in Spain and formed about a quarter of the allied force which defeated Napoleon at Waterloo. We have never fought a great land campaign against a European Power in the whole of our history. We have never faced a European enemy with more than 40,000 men; the balance has been made up by foreigners. And on the strength of that we talk of having beaten the world! And we are told that we shall never be confronted with the conditions of Continental warfare! We shall be confronted with them, we failed in the past when confronted with them, and we are going into the next war with an army far weaker in proportion to those of Europe than it ever has been before, and under circumstances where failure will mean ruin. As to the idea that we possess a peculiar power of "muddling through," it just amounts to this—we have never taken any great risks and have thereby avoided great disasters. The time is coming when we must take risks or perish.

It will surely be seen that here are all the elements of national disaster. Leaders who rely on deception, a people who have the truth hidden from them, a history misunderstood and a sense of security the result of national vanity and inexperience of the realities of war. As to the cant commonly talked about our "voluntary" system, if we only possessed a little more imagination we should soon cease to glory in it. We dress up a sergeant and deck him with a little rosette of red, white and blue to attract the eye of youth. Eventually a poor pale starved-looking

wretch will fall into his net. Very rarely, so the recruiting statistics tell us, does any man join who is not feeling hungry. And this is the voluntary system! This degradation of the profession of arms has been the forerunner of every nation's ruin in the past.

War when it comes will entail a fight to a finish on sea and land. Germany has issued a direct challenge to British sea-power in the preamble of her Navy Act of 1900. Her aim is the creation of a fleet which in the event of war will be so strong as to endanger British supremacy on the sea. On land it is her intention openly expressed to disregard the neutrality of other nations and all treaties guaranteeing the independence of those nations. Belgium and Switzerland are to be invaded and France crushed between forces converging from the north and east. That great battle once fought and won she believes, not without reason, that peace will be secured with Russia on favourable terms. If Great Britain still resists she will find a United Europe against her. These facts are known to every soldier and diplomatist in Europe. Our politicians alone ignore them.

And what is the remedy? Only that now, even at the eleventh hour, the country will listen to the words of Lord Roberts; only that there shall come a national awakening and the people demand the truth; only that those whose duty it is to lead them will put every other consideration aside, and however great the obstacles in their path point them to the way of national duty and responsibility. Then and only then can we hope to pass safely through the trial that lies before us.

PERCY.

THE DECAY OF PATRIOTISM IN ENGLAND

The question is whether the creative power which has shaped the Empire is dead, dying, or sick.—PROFESSOR CRAMB.

TIME has strange ironies. A decade or so ago Frenchmen were asking, "In what does the Anglo-Saxon superiority consist?" and giving various answers to that question. That there was an Anglo-Saxon superiority they all admitted. In those days it was supposed that the British character was above all others patriotic, that British institutions rested upon a rock, and that the British constitution was strong and stable in contrast with the political instability of continental institutions. In 1898, an acute American observer declared, after a visit to Europe, that in Britain alone he saw indications of permanency; France, Germany, Austria, Italy and Russia he thought were all at the mercy of accidents, and their Governments might vanish like dream-shadows before revolution. At that date, British naval and military power seemed outwardly adequate. The weakness of the British army had not been revealed by the Boer War, and the armaments of Continental Europe had not reached their present colossal figures. Of air power no one dreamed; had not Lord Kelvin announced that there was "nothing in" mechanical flight? The British state still represented the conception of justice; its Government had not then succumbed to the tyranny of the hob-nailed boot.

Now all has changed. No one can pretend to-day that Britain spiritually leads Europe. The true renaissance, the movement which may affect the future of the world more vitally than any event since the revolution, proceeds from France. We are witnessing nothing less than the re-birth

of a nation, and that at a time when the fires in the British heart appear to be waning, and when Britain, according to a foreign critic,* is giving visible signs of exhaustion and senility. Men are, indeed, beginning to ask, "in what lies the superiority of France," and how has this tremendous change in her character, which puts us to shame, been accomplished? So entirely have the tables been turned since 1898. Those who look closely at our British institutions see now that their stability and order has vanished. The impulses of a single Chamber sway our destiny; a tyranny of wire-pullers exercises despotic control over the single Chamber. The Sovereign's power has been wrenched from him by a "felon blow." Our national unity is sold to purchase the votes of a party in foreign pay, and the loyalists of Ulster are treated by friends of the rights of man as though they were of less account than cattle or "niggers." Trade Unions have been set above the law and wrong perpetrated by them has by statute been made no longer actionable. The right of private individuals to possess property of their own is slowly being destroyed. The shocks of the railway strike and the great coal strike have proved how precarious are the foundations of British industry and the social system. Within, as the result of eight years of incitement to class warfare, we are weaker than at any time in the immediate past. Without, in comparison with our rivals, we are weaker than at any time in our national history since the war of American Independence. With a regular army which barely weighs in the balance of modern land power; with a fleet the capacity of which to command the North Sea is growing yearly more doubtful; with an air service which hardly exists, though our insularity has for ever been ended by this new art of man—the United Kingdom of to-day is an anachronism. The world is cruel to anachronisms, else would Poland still figure on the map, and the Turkish Empire stand intact in Europe and Africa.

Nations have the Governments which they deserve; and no great State was ever overthrown in war that did not richly merit defeat. The outward and visible decay of British power would be impossible without an inward deterioration in the British character. In a large part of the nation patriotism seems extinct,

* Dembski, *Europe and the New Sea Law*, 6–11.

and our modern system of education is one of the direct causes of its extinction by devoting excessive attention to the intellect and too little to the formation of character, by neglecting history—that great teacher of mankind. Thus we have this grave verdict upon the young men of Manchester by a Manchester man, in a study which is worthy of the closest attention:

> Only in exceptional instances does a boy who has to depend on free elementary education gather any notion of what forces have created the England of to-day, of the conditions on which its greatness rests, and of the facts and circumstances in history that really bear on the public questions which he and his fellow Britons have to decide. He learns very little about Greater Britain and nothing about modern Europe. Patriotism is hardly taught. Few Manchester schools celebrate Empire Day. An allusion at a public meeting in Manchester to "our country" is usually greeted with the cry, "We have not got a country." So destitute of public spirit is a quite common type of the young Englishman who has been compulsorily educated . . . to the satisfaction of the Board of Education.*

Nor is this phenomenon peculiar to Manchester. It is as marked in Yorkshire, Durham and Northumberland, in fact in the whole industrial north of England. Speakers in the 1910 elections, who drew attention to the German menace, were told by their audiences that English workers had nothing to lose and would indeed prefer German rule. In Scotland, men have ceased to think of "our country," except in the narrowest and most particularist sense—a sense that would have brought tears to the eyes of that loyal and gallant gentleman, Sir Walter Scott. In the south, this indifference or even hostility to the idea of the nation is not unknown, though it is less common and wide-spread. What we have to face is a marked decline in national spirit in our industrial class, and this at the very time when in Germany, France, Italy and Japan that spirit is growing stronger with each year. The disease is the graver because it is also to be found among the *élite* of our youth, where we should expect to see idealism triumphant. The sentiments of a modern young man who has undergone the discipline of public school and university training, and who claims to speak for many of his class, have been set forth in the following passage of a truly remarkable article against compulsory military service in the *Daily Mail*:

> To me the prospect of military service would be depressing. My normal existence consists of a certain amount of work which I enjoy, of a certain amount of [illegible]

* Hertz, *The Manchester Politician*, 96.

which is necessary and pleasant, and a certain amount of that literary and social activity which is not only delightful in itself but an essential part of the complete life. All this would have to be laid aside for a definite period; how long is uncertain, but to be of any use it would have to be a long one. To be laid aside in order that I might indulge in the loathsome routine of military exercises, with all their miserable accompaniments. I should have to wear absurd and uncomfortable clothes, perform embarrassing exercises with unfamiliar instruments, inhabit dreary quarters—in a word, order my existence on the—to me—most repulsive plan.

Everywhere else in Europe, even in the smaller States, military service is courageously accepted as a duty by the young men. In France and Germany it has indeed become almost a reproach not to have "served." Young Frenchmen are at this hour setting a magnificent example by the cheerfulness with which they are facing the prospect of an additional year of military service. Whereas France is requiring of all her sons three years training with the colours, the most that has been proposed for the Territorial Force in England is six months' compulsory training. But it seems that the educated young Englishman will not give up even that amount of time from his games and his "literary and social activity." Elsewhere throughout the world, the man's duty to defend his womankind is recognised as the first and greatest of obligations. In this country, however, our cultured youth indignantly reject that task and vapour of the horrors and vulgarity of war as an excuse. They show no excessive alacrity to face any kind of danger and discomfort. Where the wealthy young Frenchman takes to flying and is willing to risk his life in it, the wealthy young Englishman thinks first of his ease. How many amateur flying men have we to-day, and is not their paucity in comparison with the number of French airmen a cause of sorrow and reproach?

If the "nut" shirks and boasts of shirking, little surprise can be felt that the hooligan also skulks and prefers to hang round the street corners rather than to march or drill. He is no more eager to undergo the "loathsome routine" of military service or the wearing of "absurd and uncomfortable clothes" than the University prig. Hence it is that the Territorial Force is collapsing through want of men, though the demands made upon the rank and file of the force are modest enough—a mere fortnight in camp each year and a few drills. The men in the Force do not see why they should sacrifice themselves to

secure greater leisure and comfort for the "nut" and the hooligan. For the most part they are perfectly willing to play their part in any scheme which applies compulsion to the shirkers. But they are not willing to work harder in order that the worthless may dodge the performance of their duty, and we can scarcely blame them. Moreover, they know one and all that the Force is a sham worthy of British mandarins. An army that is to receive its military training after war has broken out is a conception worthy of the brain of Lord Haldane, which admirably illustrates the sincerity of his lectures on the "necessity of clear thinking at the start." There has been nothing like it since the painted wooden cannon of the Chinese.

The collapse of the Territorial Force becomes far more serious in view of two facts—the rapid decline in British naval superiority and the enormous increase in Continental armies. Owing to want of ships and men, the British hold on the North Sea is becoming more and more precarious each year, while the Mediterranean has been practically abandoned by our battleships. The British Admiralty has renounced all intention of maintaining in the Mediterranean more than a "single-Power" fleet, whatever that means. As there are two Powers belonging to the Triple Alliance in the Mediterranean, both with strong and growing fleets, it follows that the British fleet in the Mediterranean is certain to be outmatched, unless this country has allies bound to it by a definite pact. Mr. Asquith's statement in the House of Commons last month shows that there is no alliance and no definite pact with France and Russia. Nor can there be unless this country is able to guarantee France support on land in considerable strength with extreme celerity. No guarantee of this kind can be given with the Territorial Force so weak and untrained that a large part of the regular army would have to be kept at home, garrisoning our ports and preparing to repel a foreign disembarkation. General Bonnal, eight years ago, declared that our British military conceptions belonged to the eighteenth century, because they assumed that indefinite time would be given. No military force is of serious value in modern days which is not fit to take the field in a fortnight. The decisive battle in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 was fought four weeks after the declaration of war. The decisive battle in the Franco-

German War of 1870 was fought six weeks after the declaration of war. The decisive battle in the Balkan conflict was fought twenty-eight days after the order to mobilise. It is calculated that in a struggle between France and Germany, the decisive battle would begin eight days after the order to mobilise. In a war between Britain and Germany, the decisive action at sea would probably be over in less than forty-eight hours from the outbreak of war; and if Germany won, the landing of her troops would follow within a week. What would be the use of a British force which would not be ready to fight till six months after the arrival of the German?

It is this extraordinary swiftness of modern war—the speed with which the decision will be reached when one of the combatants is caught at a disadvantage—and the irrevocable nature of the disasters that ensue, which render the systematic organisation of this country for war a question of such overpowering urgency. Compared with this, all other issues are trivial. If the nation is not going to survive an armed attack, it is useless to think of social reform or a minimum wage or improvements of the Insurance Act or Home Rule, a measure which from the national standpoint is criminal, because it means the dismemberment of the nation—the surest cause of weakness. There must be many Liberals who view with concern the present naval and military position of their country. What do they think of their Ministers and of their Press? And if, condemning their Ministers and Press, they do not make their will felt, are they not guilty of the gravest unfaithfulness to the claims of patriotism?

They may or may not think compulsory service a good thing. But they can hardly ignore the fact that without it, it is impossible to build up a strong Territorial Force, and therefore impossible to secure allies on the Continent, and therefore impossible to command the Mediterranean in a possible war with Germany and her allies, and therefore impossible to assure the food of the British worker. For one half of our cereals reach us by the Mediterranean route. Within the past month the Continental Powers have decided to strengthen their armed forces as follows:

Germany, addition of 160,000 men to the strength of her army, following upon a previous addition of 100,000 in 1912, at a cost of at least £50,000,000 initial expenditure.

France, addition of 160,000 men by returning to a system of universal three-years service for all able-bodied Frenchmen.

Russia, addition of three army corps, or, say, 100,000 men.

Austria, addition of 75,000 men to the peace effectives.

Italy, additional naval programme, exact particulars doubtful.

Belgium, introduction of compulsory service.

So far as is known, the British reply to these stupendous efforts will consist in the following measures: (1) a reduction of our priceless regular artillery (by six batteries or thirty-six guns); (2) a reduction of two or three millions in the Navy Estimates as originally prepared by the Admiralty in January, before these immense increases in Continental armaments; (3) an invitation to the National Reserve, one of our numerous paper armies, to fill up the yawning gaps in the Territorial Force, with men up to the age of fifty-five, who have received no training whatever in modern warfare.

Not only will our Ministers not take any steps to arm the nation; they also place every conceivable obstacle in the way of those who, like Lord Roberts and Lord Percy, would tell it the truth and call upon it for strenuous efforts. No rôle is so shameful as this of these partisans who strive to lull a careless and sluggish people to sleep "with piano tunes" and mendacious assurances. And the dishonour of it is deepened by the fact that one of the principal offenders, Colonel Seely, the present Secretary of State for War, himself, in far less dangerous times, declared compulsory service essential. Not only in the *National Review*, but also in a series of speeches, he proclaimed in 1902, when this country had a much larger measure of preponderance at sea than it possesses to-day, compulsory military training to be right and necessary. He has since committed *il gran rifiuto*, and he has committed it to remain in office. And, again, we have Mr. Illingworth, the Chief Liberal Whip, denouncing as a "diabolical Tory trick," what he calls "the infamous attempt to stampede the country into conscription," and instead of arousing it to the danger, throwing dust in its eyes with the old dishonest quibbles. Here is a man who, knowing that Germany possesses an "all-powerful army," which she is vastly increasing—

for the purpose, as the *Cologne Gazette* has admitted, of war against France, France having incurred German enmity because she is Britain's friend—and that the German Admiralty is creating with all possible speed a "conscript" navy of gigantic proportions, tells his audience this:

If we had an all-powerful navy and a conscript army, we should lay ourselves open to the charge among Continental Powers, that we were desiring such an arrangement not merely for purposes of defence, but for aggression.

It is right for Germany to build ships, to increase both her navy and army. It is wrong for England to meet such increases by countervailing preparations. This is sophistry run mad, but it is also the blackest disloyalty to our common country.

Behind the unpatriotic sophists of the Cabinet and Ministry are the unpatriotic sophists of the Liberal Press. There is the *Westminster Gazette*, for example, which thinks it will be a "most salutary check" if British Governments have to rely upon "voluntary enthusiasm" in war. The person who suggested that the captain of an English eleven should trust to enthusiasm and not to training to win test matches would be rightly dismissed as an imbecile, though it may be noted that an experiment in this direction was made in athletics in the case of the Olympic Games, with none too glorious result to British reputation. To rely upon "voluntary enthusiasm" in modern war means defeat. Is it defeat that the *Westminster Gazette* desires for our country? Or perhaps, it will say that the certainty of defeat will lead British Governments to avoid war by yielding to foreign demands, and that this is an object worthy of attainment. In that case it seeks the surrender of British interests before the threat of force—a truly heroic and patriotic course, worthy of a journal which argues that eight ships at Gibraltar are for all practical purposes in the North Sea, and that the same fleet may be in two different places at once. Arguments of this kind could scarcely be advanced by patriotic men to a patriotic public. We can only conclude that the writers who advance them, and the men who listen to them care nothing for the nation, but only seek their own comfort and ease, recking nothing of what that comfort and ease may cost their unhappy countrymen.

Or, again, we have the *Daily News*, that "national Liberal organ" which claims the largest circulation of any Liberal

newspaper. Its policy may be summed up thus: friendship with every Power that opposes British policy and enmity to every Power that is friendly to this country. When France and Russia were our rivals, it was pro-Russian and pro-French. Now that Germany is our rival, it is pro-German. It has in turns been pro-Lama and pro-Boer; in fact, it is pro-everything but its country. A superficial observer might imagine that this attitude proceeded from an antipathy to violence and a love for that vegetable existence which passively submits to wrong. But that idea is dispelled when it is noted that this same newspaper is for dragooning Ulster by force into submission to an alien Government, and that it is perpetually inciting class to make war upon class in this country. The sentimentalist must be consistent, or he must be prepared to be regarded as a hypocrite —and the peculiar attitude of this journal to betting news has already aroused grave doubt as to its affected virtue. Mr. Stiggins is no lovely figure in fiction. But when in the editorial columns of a newspaper he wages war upon his own country's interests in the cause of what he calls righteousness, he excites nausea, or would excite it in a more virile people.

With a degenerate youth, a disloyal Government and a treacherous Press, the outlook for Britain is not precisely bright with hope. Yet if France has been saved from her false prophets by the revolt of her youth, and if French thought has undergone such a profound transformation in less than ten years—for in 1905 every worthless "ism" and every kind of partisan animosity was rife across the Channel—there is in the nature of things no reason why, with strenuous efforts, a similar awakening should not be possible in Britain. It is true that we have not here the potent lever of universal military training with which to work, and that games are a sorry substitute for it. But the individuals who are shaping and moulding British thought so ignobly and accepting wrong so tamely must themselves pass away; the race will remain for another generation to restore its energy and vitality, if hope is not lost, if only our great rivals abroad will give us time. France, having saved herself by her exertions, may yet save us by her example, to vary the most famous speech that Pitt ever delivered.

The salvation of France has come from her thinkers. What-

ever view we take of Bergson's philosophy, its effect upon France has been that of inspiration. For Bergson has discredited the positive sciences and has shown, with a certain measure of success, that they cannot explain the facts of life. He has shaken the mechanistic and materialist doctrine and given back to mankind the freedom of human will. He has taught men to distrust pure intellectualism and the conclusions of formal logic. He has sent them back to faith. "I shall never forget," M. Lotte* has said, "the emotion with which *l'Évolution Créatrice* carried me away. I found God on each page of it." *L'Évolution Créatrice* appeared in 1906. So overwhelming is the power of noble thought, that in seven years it has transformed the ideas of a nation. Yet the same creed of action and faith will be found in our greatest modern English thinkers. Dr. Bosanquet's philosophy, for example, though it differs vitally on many points from Bergson's, has this in common with Bergson, that it preaches the gospel of action, and emphasises the importance of personality. It is essentially idealist and hostile to materialism:

If there is to be a self-directing system of life, adapting itself to a universe which is its environment, there must be pain and death. . . . Religion does not belong to the hazards and hardships of finite selfhood, but rather to its security and happiness. Yet in an account of the significance of pain and an estimate of its rank and rootedness in experience, it would be a grave omission not to touch upon the fact that the great religion of the Western world announces itself as a religion of suffering. By a religion of suffering I mean one which emphasises and requires its disciples in some sense to share the sufferings of its Founder.†

And again in dealing with the great problem of war:

I seem to observe an extraordinary eclecticism in the toleration of pain and trouble, as if Marathon and Salamis were somehow obviously fine and desirable events, while modern battles of a less picturesque type, and attended no doubt by miseries on a more enormous scale in the way of neglected wounded—not to speak of the thousand-fold horrors of our civilisation in its grimmer and dirtier parts—were obviously and self-evidently to be ruled out as intolerable. . . . This view is very startling and . . . it would need a great deal of explanation and defence to make it in any way plausible.‡

And yet again:

The Utopian temper, as a rule, seems dull and inhuman; and there is something mediæval in the worst sense about the idea of a future in which—to take a typical example—tragedy is to be enjoyed without any tragic experience.§

* *Les Jeunes Gens d'Aujourd'hui*, 83.

† Bosanquet, *Value and Destiny of the Individual*, 171, 183.

‡ Ibid. 158. § Ibid. 179.

The best English contemporary philosophy thus teaches that pain must be calmly and bravely faced; that war must be accepted as a law of our present human life; that the Utopian state of society, as conceived by our intellectual wool-gatherers, in which material enjoyment is the end of life, is something repellent or indeed horrible; that "the great fundamental values" are "love and courage and self-sacrifice." Nor is it a mere accident that quite a different thinker,* starting from entirely different premises, reaches the same conclusion—that "the fate of empires" is bound up with the development of the religious and altruistic motive in man.

Yet what has been achieved in France with such speed is likely to be much slower of accomplishment in this country. Not even the most factious and disloyal of Frenchmen can wholly ignore the danger from Germany, with the memory of the defeats and disasters of 1870 in his mind. The need for a life of action and heroism unless the nation is to perish, is evident. With Britain, as Captain Mahan has said, the apparent security which insularity gives (though insularity has vanished for ever with the coming of aircraft) "begets an optimistic attitude towards external dangers," and plays into the hands of the shirkers and false prophets. Moreover, in France thought passes more rapidly from the *élite* to the ranks of the people. Even there it is a rare and exceptional phase for a doctrine to take less than ten years in thus filtering down. In England the philosophy—or what passes for such—of the intellectuals of the working class is at least twenty years behind the thought of the *élite*. Thus, to judge from working-class newspapers and speeches, the working man is still dominated by the materialist ideas of Haeckel and by the fantastic teaching of Marx, with which, perhaps, is now stirred a little admixture of Sorel, himself a thinker, who in France is passing out of vogue, but who has a value in that he is an advocate of action.

The first sign of the British awakening will be given when the nation sweeps away, as the French nation swept M. Caillaux's traitorous and cowardly administration away in 1911, a Government which, from Prime Minister to its salaried voters in the House of Commons, is tainted with degeneracy, guilty of the

* Dr. Hubbard in *The Fate of Empires*

betrayal of the deepest national interests, and more dangerous to the future of our race than any enemy openly building ships and arming men outside our gates. With Ministers rests the direct responsibility for the three most terrible blows inflicted on our social order in modern time:' the destruction of our security from external attack by the weakening of the Navy and of the military forces of the Crown; the destruction of our security within by the shattering blows which they have dealt to the rights of private property; and the impairment of our power hereafter to meet the German armanents by the ruinous obligation which they have piled upon British credit. In seven short years they have sacrificed the present and mortgaged the future of the nation, to satisfy their own selfish lust for place and power. No surer indication of the deterioration in British character and energy can be found than in the fact that the country has stood still and looked on unmoved while these things were being done.

Except this nation be born again, it will not long retain its kingdom upon earth. A people of skulkers, *fainéants* and helpless indifferentists, torn by faction and exploited by political adventurers, can never hold the hegemony of a world-wide Empire. It is because Germany despises us that she seeks to displace us; her hostility is due to her fixed belief that we are given up to corruption and decay.

If we are to live as a great State, we must prove to her by deeds that she is wrong.

IGNOTUS.

CITIZENSHIP AND DUTY*

GENTLEMEN,

Four weeks ago to-day, as many of you are doubtless aware, I had the pleasure of speaking to a Bristol audience upon the defence of these islands and the necessity of National Service in arms, and here at Wolverhampton to-night it is on this same momentous subject that I desire to address you. It is unnecessary, I trust, that I should dilate to you on the privilege I feel it to be that I am given this opportunity of addressing so large an audience in this famous stronghold of Liberalism; for this matter is entirely above Party considerations, and should go straight to the heart of every Liberal in this city. For, rightly understood, what is more consonant with the first and historical principles of Radicalism than that the burden of military as of any other service should fall indiscriminately upon every citizen alike, high and low, rich and poor, without exemption of any kind whatever? Equality in arms is as ancient a maxim of British civic life as equality before the law. He alone is the complete freeman who feels that he is able to fulfil his duty as the defender of his home and his country. This principle is the very corner-stone of self-respecting manhood; and, in a democratic nation, it is, or ought to be, the corner-stone of all healthy political life.

Your very enthusiasm here at Wolverhampton for the Territorial system proves that you have felt this; it proves that you have done the utmost so far as that system allows to carry this principle into realisation. Your companies in all arms are amongst the most efficient, not only in the Midlands, but over the whole of England; and I must rely on your candour and

* Speech delivered by Field-Marshal Earl Roberts, V.C., K.G., at Wolverhampton on March 14, 1912.

clear-sightedness not to misunderstand me if, in spite of that devotion and that patriotism, I have to speak to you to-night of the inadequacy and insufficiency of the Territorial system. The patriotism, and the devotion of men and officers alike, I appreciate most fully; but I should be false to that very devotion, false to you as my fellow-citizens, and I should be a traitor to this nation if, at this hour of crisis and urgency, I did not speak to you openly and frankly, or if I allowed a great meeting like this to disperse without putting the whole position clearly before you.

I would ask, then, what are the requirements of National Defence, and what steps have been taken by the present Government or the nation as a whole, which stands behind every Government and shares its responsibilities, to meet those requirements?

Let me state the matter quite simply and with as few technicalities as possible.

We require, first of all, a Navy that shall be strong enough not only to deal effectively with the fleets of other Powers, but strong enough also to ensure the safety of our trade routes. Under Free Trade we have, rightly or wrongly, ceased to grow our own corn, and one immediate and very significant result is that our modern Navy has to face a task from which the navies of the past—the navies of Rodney and Nelson, for example—were quite free, for in the twentieth century our Fleets have to guard these islands not merely against invasion, but against starvation.

A supreme Navy is therefore necessary to our very existence as a free people.

But these islands do not stand alone; they are the centre of a great and famous Empire with Colonies or Dependencies scattered over every sea. These must be secure in peace and in war, and for that purpose garrisons are necessary; and this garrison duty can only be effectively performed by a Regular Army raised on the voluntary principle; it must further be in our power to reinforce those garrisons from an ample reserve force quartered here in Great Britain.

Lastly, we require, I maintain, a Citizen Army; an Army that is to say, in which every able-bodied man—not serving in the Regulars, in the Navy, or in the Mercantile Marine, who, as

a youth, has undergone compulsory training—shall, at the call of duty, be compelled to take his place in the ranks for the defence of these shores.

I have so far not even contemplated any offensive operations; nor have I thus far considered the time-honoured and traditional European policy of this nation—the maintenance of the Balance of Power on the Continent; that is to say, the frustration of the ambition of any single Power to dominate the Continent as Louis XIV. attempted to dominate the Continent in the seventeenth century, and as Napoleon actually did dominate the Continent in the beginning of the nineteenth century. For such a dominance threatens at once the safety of these islands. What did our unpreparedness to adjust effectively that Balance of Power in the time of Napoleon cost us? It cost us not only the precious lives sacrificed in the Peninsular War, but £600,000,000 of solid money, and of the debt thus incurred you are paying the interest to this day. I say to you, therefore, that the task of meeting the new demands imposed upon it, the keeping open our trade routes as well as the preoccupying of a hostile Fleet, is the utmost that our Navy can now accomplish; and in the same manner, the garrison work which I have described, and the fulfilment, however inadequately, of our bounden duty to a Continental ally, for the maintenance of the Balance of Power, would monopolise the whole strength of our Regular Army.

What, then, would be left to guard these shores?

The answer of the present Government through Lord Haldane the other day in the Upper House was—the Territorial Force!

Now, gentlemen, a complex and difficult task here confronts me. I have to seek to uproot ancient prejudices; I have, in the obstinate silence of Ministers and politicians, to attempt to compel this nation to use its own eyes and its own mind; and to you, men of Wolverhampton, I have to speak of duties, not rights.

And here, again, I must beg of you not to misunderstand me. In what I have to say of Lord Haldane and his scheme I am *not* speaking of him as the War Minister in a Liberal Government, nor as Lord Chancellor in that same Government; I am speaking of him as a citizen, anxious as I am anxious, to place the safety,

the honour, and the continued prosperity of this great nation upon a lasting and unassailable basis, but differing from me essentially in his conception of the manner in which that lasting and unassailable basis is to be established.

The Territorials, Lord Haldane affirms, are, or shortly will be, numerous enough and disciplined enough to perform every function of a Home Army. In any case, he asserts, such a force is the best that this nation can now provide, and it is therefore our duty not to criticise or decry it, but to make the most of it; and as a proof of its efficiency he said he had been assured that, if opposed to an invading Army half or a quarter of its number, they would fight "like fiends."

Mr. Mayor and gentlemen, I have the utmost respect for Lord Haldane's patriotism, but I cannot help recognising that his ideas on tactics and strategy are, to say the least of them, somewhat peculiar, and that apparently he fails utterly to appreciate the requirements of modern warfare. I feel, therefore, that, in the interests of my country, I must take the liberty to traverse his position point by point.

Let me to-night, my friends, speak to you quite unreservedly. What I have to say to you is that no commander, unless in the direst extremity, would lead into battle against the disciplined armies of Europe such a force as Lord Haldane has in view. It would be to lead them to certain destruction—food for shrapnel in very deed. If during the next six months, by stress of dancing parties and similar inducements, the shortage of 50,000 Territorials could be made up, if the full quota of men and officers already stood to arms, I still should say to you that is not the Army which this Empire requires; it is the beginning of such an Army, but it is not the Army itself. Numbers are not enough. Insufficiently trained men, however great their numbers, can be of no use in war and may be a positive danger. What is the lesson even of the war of 1870, when the strain was less terrific, the ordeal less appallingly rapid, than at the present day? Why, gentlemen, Lord Haldane's own hypothetical superiority of four to one, which he imagines our Territorials to possess over an invading force, though it is a rash hypothesis, did not avail the French, brave men as they were, gallant men, loving their country, anxious but to serve it or die for it. I cite but one

occasion from the second phase of that war. In that second phase 140,000 levies—more or less ill-trained—confronted 35,000 disciplined Germans. What was the result? In three weeks 60,000 were dead, wounded, or prisoners, and the remainder, demoralised and panic-stricken, were flying beyond the frontier. That is the lesson of 1870; and what else is the lesson of 1912—of the Balkan War? But yesterday it was, in the phrase of a great historian, superfluous to praise the valour of a Turk. I can remember—some of you can remember also—Osman Pasha and his 40,000 bayonets as they marched out of Plevna after one of the most heroic defences in history. Those Turks fought in 1877, and, no doubt, their descendants were prepared in 1912 to fight equally well; but modern war is a great chiller of undisciplined enthusiasm, and before the more highly trained Bulgarians they had no chance. Neither would our Territorials have a chance to-day if they were opposed to highly trained and highly disciplined troops.

Lord Haldane in his later utterances denies that he ever expected a space of six months to be given to the Territorial Force to prepare to stand in the firing line. His contention now is that the Force would, in front of the enemy, grow better and more effective every day. How many days does he imagine that such a Force, decimated by the long-range fire of practised marksmen, would be allowed, under the swift and relentless operations of a disciplined enemy—how many days, I repeat, would be allowed for half-trained troops to be turned into disciplined soldiers?

Gentlemen, it daunts the very heart of any experienced soldier to contemplate the fate of such an Army; courage would avail them nothing—except to die; generalship would avail them nothing, except to make the leaders realise, with vain regret or impotent despair, what things might have been dared or done with discipline, recognising with rage as the masses were mowed down that theirs, theirs once more, had been the "Valour of Ignorance," the most fatal and tragic of all forms of valour, whether in peace or war.

Nor do I share Lord Haldane's conviction that the Territorial Force is the best that, at this hour, Britain can obtain. I am convinced, on the contrary—and it is in that conviction that I

have undertaken this campaign—that, unless Britons have totally fallen from their ancient courage, their patriotic ardour, love of freedom and common sense, within a short period we shall have a national Army worthy of the name—an Army in which this great nation can feel a true pride and a true interest, an Army which shall at once be a school and an exercise-ground for the youth and the manhood of a free, democratic, and enlightened people. And what school and what exercise-ground, at once in its advantages, its self-devotion, its equal endurance of hardships, will so boldly recall the best examples of the Republics of antiquity? For in that school the young men of every rank and class will, between the ages of eighteen and twenty, exercise side by side, and share equally and alike in the same health-giving and strength-giving discipline, the same food, the same lodging, the same clothing, the same comforts or discomforts of every kind; the son of the peer side by side with the son of the peasant, the merchant's son beside the clerk's, the factory-owner's beside the artisan's, the farmer's beside the land-owner's. For it is a gross and inexcusable misrepresentation to allege that in the Army contemplated by the National Service League the sons of the well-to-do will all be officers and the sons of the workers all in the ranks. Merit, and merit alone, character, and the talent for war will determine who are to be officers and who are to be privates. It is an equally gross and inexcusable misrepresentation to allege that, at the termination of his period of training, the young artisan will find himself without employment. The nation and the Government will be pledged. The nation and the Government, by special arrangement with every employer, will guarantee the safety of his employment.

True it is, on the other hand, that the creation of such an Army will call for the small sacrifice, by every able-bodied youth of the nation, of a few months of his time—when he reaches the age of eighteen. But, on this earth of ours, what great good has ever been, or can ever be, gained except by sacrifice? It is in every era and in every zone alike the law of life and the law of religion. But it will not be all a sacrifice or all a surrender; for during that training the young men of the nation will be compelled to pass their time mainly in the open air and under con-

ditions the most calculated to foster strength of body and of character, quickness of intelligence, moral fibre. Do not believe, I urge you, that you will be badly housed and badly fed and badly clothed. Which of you that has been inside a modern barrack and compared its rooms and its sanitation, its mess-tables and recreation grounds, with the slums of our great cities, can for a moment listen to such absurd and monstrous statements? And above all things deliver yourselves from the bugbear of oppression, the tyranny and the terror of military discipline and military obedience. To true manhood, to the truly noble and free-born spirit, " I must " is ever a higher word than " I will." Self-effacement in the moral world is the very basis of all true self-assertion, and in the political world it is the basis of all true citizenship; for in every phase of human life only he who has learned to obey knows fitly how to command, and in this, I think, every man of you who has risen to be a foreman or ruler over his fellows in any way will bear me out.

Such then, my friends, and no other, is my ideal, and such, and no other, are my hopes—to-day my strong and confident hopes; for, despite Lord Haldane's repeated assertions to the contrary, I cannot believe that the spirit of Great Britain is so fallen from its ancient chivalry and valour, is so sunk in self-indulgent unconcern, that it will only stir to dismiss from office any statesman or any Minister who dares to propose this honour-giving and this life-giving reform!

Is it too much, Mr. Mayor and gentlemen, to hope that Wolverhampton and the men of South Staffordshire will display the same zeal and patriotism in helping to bring this Army into actuality as they have displayed in the muster-rolls of that Force which even its adherents and supporters now reluctantly admit to have been tried in the balance and found wanting?

And again, let me remind you, such a National Army will *not* be a Conscript Army; for it is not for a moment proposed to make service in the Regular Overseas Army compulsory. That is no part of the National Service League's proposals. Perhaps I could not put our scheme more tersely than if I were to say that our ideal is a Territorial Army in which not the self-sacrificing, high-minded, and patriotic only, but every young man, I say again, shall for his own well-being and his nation's

good be compelled to take his part and do his duty like a true-born Briton; and, further, a Territorial Army in which, instead of a hopelessly inadequate training, every young man shall acquire by drill and discipline those habits of obedience, endurance, fortitude, resolution and self-independence, which will at once enable him, not only to face each day's tasks more efficiently, but to acquit himself with honour in the field against any enemy that dares to set foot on these shores. It will be an Army for the defence of these islands only. And here I would repeat what I said at Bristol, that such an Army will never be used to prevent men striking for what they consider their rights. It will be an Army thoroughly British and thoroughly democratic in character, because it will be created by a nation's spontaneous and voluntary self-sacrifice; it will not be a burden imposed by an exterior or tyrannous Government, but the result of the nation's free choice, ratified by a free Parliament.

Men of Wolverhampton—Radicals, Liberals and Unionists alike—is it too much, I again ask, to hope that you will take a foremost part in bringing such an Army into being, that you, officers and men of the Territorials, will by your experience see the necessity for such an Army and be emulous of the honour of forcing upon our politicians your imperative demand that they shall speedily bring this matter before Parliament—and is it too much to hope that this great meeting to-night will not simply dissolve as from some place of amusement, but that all of you will carry in your hearts the deep resolve that for Britain's sake this thing *can* be done, and with the help of God and your true hearts, that this thing, for Britain's sake, *shall* be done?

ROBERTS, F.M.

DAYLIGHT IN THE MARCONI MYSTERY

I

MINISTERS *v.* *LE MATIN*

The following pages reproduce textually the transcript of the shorthand notes of the action "Samuel v. *le Matin" and "Isaacs* v. *le Matin." This we believe is a fuller report than has appeared in any newspaper, and differs from such reports. We beg our readers to follow it with the utmost care, so that they may appreciate the subsequent comments and the gravity of the facts now for the first time disclosed on oath.*—EDITOR, *National Review.*

In the High Court of Justice, King's Bench Division. Royal Courts of Justice, Wednesday, March 19, 1913. Before MR. JUSTICE DARLING: SAMUEL *v.* *Le Matin*; ISAACS *v.* SAME.

The Right Hon. Sir EDWARD CARSON, K.C., M.P., Mr. F. E. SMITH, K.C., M.P., Mr. SCHWABE, and Mr. RAYMOND ASQUITH appeared for the Plaintiffs.

The Right Hon. J. H. M. CAMPBELL, K.C., M.P., and Mr. SCHILLER appeared for the Defendants.

Sir Edward Carson: May it please your lordship. My lord, there are two cases which your lordship has allowed to be put into the List this morning, one of which is brought by the Postmaster-General, Mr. Herbert Samuel, who is a Privy Councillor and a Member of Parliament, and the other is brought by the Attorney-General, who is also a Privy Councillor and a Member of Parliament, complaining of a libel which was contained in a French newspaper called *Le Matin* on February 14 in the present year. The libel, as your lordship will see in a few moments, imputes the very greatest corruption to these two high Ministers,

and is one which it was impossible for them to pass by. The paper has offices and publishers in this country, and has a large circulation in this country, and, of course, has a large circulation n France and upon the Continent, and disseminated those libels not only here, to those who read French newspapers, but also—which is of considerable importance too—circulated them amongst the countries on the Continent. The libels are connected with what is now known as the Marconi contract, which was conditionally entered into by his Majesty's Government with the Marconi Wireless Telegraphy Company with a view to setting up wireless stations round the various possessions that form the British Empire. For a considerable time there had been rumours going about, but rumours of an indefinite character, suggesting that there had been some kind of impropriety in the entering into of this contract, but the first real crystallisation of these rumours into the averment of actual facts as to the alleged delinquencies of members of the Government is contained, so far as my two clients know, in this paper *Le Matin.* They were anxious, naturally—I think when your lordship hears the libel you will say naturally—at the earliest moment to give an opportunity for any one to come in and justify these libels. The libels are set out in the statement of claim. I will read it in English, as it will be more convenient to myself and probably to others. It is headed as follows:

A FINANCIAL SCANDAL IN ENGLAND,

LONDON, FEBRUARY 13.

A very grave scandal occupies the English Press Some little time ago the English Government signed a contract with the Marconi Company by which that Company bound itself in consideration of a large sum—too large, they tell me—to connect by wireless telegraphy all the British Possessions with the Mother Country. Mr. Leo Maxse, the eminent editor of the *National Review*, protested vehemently against the way in which this agreement had been concluded. He imputed that Mr. Herbert Samuel, the Postmaster-General, whose idea it was to enter into negotiations with the Company had entered into an arrangement with Sir Rufus Isaacs, Attorney-General, also a member of the Government and brother of Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director of the Marconi Company. All three had bought shares in the Company at an average price of about 50 francs, at which these shares were quoted before the opening of the negotiations with the Government, and had resold them at a profit rising to as much as 200 francs per share according as the negotiations enabled it to be foreseen that the contract would be concluded. Mr. Maxse attacked at the same time the fact

that the contract had been signed in haste on March 7 without having been brought before Parliament, as it ought to have been.

Every statement in that libel as affecting Mr. Herbert Samuel and the Attorney-General is false from beginning to end. The parties at once communicated with those who were responsible for *Le Matin*, and on February 18 they published in their paper this apology:

A FINANCIAL SCANDAL IN LONDON.
WHAT THE OFFICIAL DOCUMANTS SAY
LONDON, FEBRUARY 17.

Special telegram to "Le Matin."

Under the heading "A Financial Scandal in England" I sent you on Thursday last an abstract of the rumours which had been current with regard to the accusations brought by Mr. Leo Maxse, editor of the *National Review*, against Mr. Herbert Samuel, Sir Rufus Isaacs, the Attorney-General, and his brother Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, Managing Director of the Marconi Company. The official documents of the Parliamentary enquiry which I have just read in no way confirm these rumours; far from it. It appears therefrom that Mr. Maxse simply said in answer to his questioners that he had repeated rumours which were floating about and that he could in no case give the source of his information. Under these circumstances and pending the publication of the discussions I take the earliest opportunity of sending you this correction with an expression of regret that I should, in perfect good faith, by communicating current rumours to you, possibly have done an injury of any sort to these men of quite unimpeachable honour.

The writs were then issued, and the defence that was put in repeats the publication of that apology and says that they "now repeat their expressions of regret and say that they had not and have not any intention of making any imputation upon the honour or conduct of the plaintiffs, and that they published the words complained of in good faith and in the full belief that the same could not be understood to contain any imputation on the honour or conduct of the plaintiffs." They intimated to us that they did not intend to defend the action, that they were agreeable to pay the full indemnity costs, and that they would instruct counsel in court to make an ample apology to these two gentlemen. My lord, these two plaintiffs have accepted that, but I am bound to say that they have accepted it without damages solely because this was a French newspaper circulating mainly in France, though, as I said before, with some circulation here, and because it is quite plain that

what was sent over to the French paper was merely sent over as gossip with reference to a scandal, and one does not impute to them in what they did any motive of any kind of malice, whether political or otherwise; but whatever the position of the parties is, in their high offices, such a course could not be taken, and would not be taken, if this had been an English journal making deliberately charges here against members of the Government. My lord, I said that every charge in this libel is untrue, and having regard to the position of the parties and, indeed, in the interests of the Government and in the interests of what everybody in this country holds so dear, the character of the Ministers who are engaged in these matters on behalf of the public in entering into contracts, that there should be no suggestion or idea of any kind of delinquency or corruption in the exercise of their offices, I will ask your lordship's permission to take this opportunity of putting the two plaintiffs into the box to explain fully their whole connection with this Marconi business.

The first statement of which we complain in the libel, which, of course, is a very serious one, is this: "Mr. Leo Maxse, the eminent editor of the *National Review*, protested vehemently against the way in which this agreement had been concluded. He imputed that Mr. Herbert Samuel, the Postmaster-General, whose idea it was to enter into the negotiations with the Company, had entered into an arrangement with Sir Rufus Isaacs, Attorney-General," and Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director's brother. It is an absolute falsehood to say that it was Mr. Herbert Samuel's idea to enter into negotiations with the Company, and really in a very few words, when I trace what has happened in relation to entering into this contract, I think it will, or ought to, put an end for ever to the suggestion that in the preliminary matter or the subsequent carrying out of the matter there is anything whatsoever to complain of as regards the methods of those who had the conduct of this important matter. My lord, to suggest that the Postmaster-General was the originator of this contract—and, of course, what they mean is that in that way he had the power of knowing what was going on in the negotiations and brought in Sir Rufus Isaacs, the Attorney-General, so that he might have him in consultation with himself while he was dealing with his brother—of course is all an

insinuation that the whole basis of this contract from the beginning was a corrupt matter with a view to their putting money into their own pockets.

What happened was this, the history is very short: As far back as March 1910, the Marconi Company made an application to the Colonial Office to be allowed to erect stations in various of the Colonies that form the British Possessions. My lord, that application, which came in an ordinary way to the Colonial Office, not to the Post Office at all, was referred to in the Cable Landing Rights Committee, which is a Committee of an inter-departmental character, on which there are representatives from the Foreign Office, from the Board of Trade, from the Navy, from the Army, and the Post Office, all of these various Departments who have to consider from time to time all these various relations for telegraphy and other matters throughout the British Empire. The application was referred to them in March 1910. Mr. Samuel, the Postmaster-General, was not even a member and knew nothing whatsoever about their enquiries or negotiations. They made a report on May 19, 1911, having been investigating the matter for a considerable time. They reported that any such telegraphic stations should be State owned, and not given to a Company, but they recommended that negotiations should be entered into with the Marconi Company, as they had found that it was the only Company which existed, which had worked wireless telegraphy as a commercial success.

That was the origin of the negotiations, as you will see, which after several other Committees were eventually sent to the Postmaster-General to be carried out. With that report Mr. Samuel had nothing to do. This was then referred to the Committee of Imperial Defence, which consists to a large extent of naval and military experts and some of the Government, and they again appointed a Sub-Committee of nine members to go fully into this matter, which they did; and again there, of course, the Postmaster-General had nothing whatsoever to do with, or was not in contact with the negotiations in reference to the matter. On June 1, 1911, that Committee reported recommending that wireless stations should be erected to form a chain between the United Kingdom, India, and Australia, and they again having investigated, found that the only company which had commercially worked this

wireless telegraphy with success was the Marconi, and they recommended also that negotiations should be entered into by the Government with the Marconi to see what could be done. That was not all. The matter was then in June, after that had been received, brought before the Imperial Conference when the Prime Minister and other Ministers from our various Colonies were over in London. It was brought before the Imperial Conference, and on the motion of the Prime Minister of New Zealand it was unanimously resolved that an attempt should be made to bind the various parts of the Empire together with this chain of wireless telegraphic communication. Your lordship sees before it ever came to the Postmaster-General at all there were three distinct recommendations of this being attempted to be done, and as regards the two who had investigated the possibility of getting them erected, they had passed resolutions that negotiations should be entered into with the Marconi Company. It then becomes the duty of the Postmaster-General to attempt to carry out what has been recommended by these various Committees. He then set up a Committee again, of which he was himself the Chairman, and he had upon it the High Commissioners of South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand, with other persons to assist in formulating the best method of dealing with this important matter. That Committee went fully into the matter, and they, after enquiry, resolved that negotiations should be entered into with the Marconi as being again the only Company that they could find which could with commercial success work this business of wireless telegraphy. Does your lordship see that so far from the libel being true that it was his idea to enter into negotiations with the Company, there were actually four Committees who had all enquired, and with those four committees I have stated the relation of Mr. Samuel. He had nothing to do with three of them, and the fourth was in conjunction with the High Commissioners that I have told you of and the other members, and, of course, as probably your lordship will know, as regards the whole four of them, the Attorney-General had nothing whatever to say; he could not; it was not within his sphere; he was not a member of any of them. It had nothing to do with his department, and in point of fact he knew nothing whatsoever about the negotiations and had not heard anything about them during all those

months that these enquiries had been made. To show your lordship that there was no secrecy in the matter, the moment these negotiations began with the Marconi Company, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director of the Company (who, I may say, had been Managing Director of the Company before his brother, Sir Rufus Isaacs, had ever received office under the Government at all) stated at the meeting of the shareholders as far back as November 11, 1911, that the Government had begun to enter into negotiations with him with a view to this contract. I state that so as to show your lordship that there is no foundation for suggesting that there was any attempt or any possibility even, having regard to the communications that were made, of people making money on speculations on the Stock Exchange by having information that was not disclosed. The moment the negotiations were entered into the fact was stated by the Managing Director publicly to the shareholders and became public property.

Mr. Justice Darling : Sir Edward, you mentioned about this being untrue that Mr. Herbert Samuel, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, had the idea of beginning the negotiations.

Sir Edward Carson : Yes.

Mr. Justice Darling : When did the negotiations really begin—how long ago ?

Sir Edward Carson : They began some time at the end of 1911, my lord. The negotiations with the Company began in 1911.

Mr. Justice Darling : But it had been considered in 1910, I think ?

Sir Edward Carson : Yes. Their first application to the Colonial Office was in 1910.

Mr. Justice Darling : The only thing was this. Mr. Herbert Samuel has not always been Postmaster-General. When did he become Postmaster-General ?

Sir Edward Carson : February 1910, my lord.

Mr. Justice Darling : It was a Committee in which New Zealand was included which first of all mentioned it.

Sir Edward Carson : The Committee that he formed was in August 1911, after all those other intervening Committees had investigated it.

Mr. Justice Darling : That was what I wanted to get at. The

other Committees had investigated it before this was done, in any way under the auspices of the Postmaster-General.

Sir Edward Carson: Yes, my lord; he was merely carrying out his duty in attempting to carry out the resolution by the Imperial Conference, which was founded upon these various Committees which it had gone before. During the negotiations which took place with the Marconi Company the only person who had anything to do with it was Mr. Samuel. Of course, when I say the only person, I mean in this respect, that in a thing like wireless telegraphy, where you have to find out what are fair terms and fair conditions, he was advised, of course, by his technical advisers in his Department, but he was the responsible person. From beginning to end of the negotiations the Attorney-General never was consulted, never was asked for any advice, never was brought in in any way, directly or indirectly, and he had no more to say to it, well, than I had who have gone out of office as Solicitor-General. There are some people who have got an idea that because a man is in the Government he therefore knows everything that is going on as regards every detail in every Department.

However, to shorten the story as much as possible, as a result the Marconi Company sent in a tender on February 13, 1912. The dates are material in the case, having regard to something I have to say afterwards. That upon consideration by Mr. Samuel at many interviews between him and his advisers was accepted—and this is the material date—upon March 7, 1912. When it was accepted, of course, it could only be accepted subject to the Standing Orders of the House of Commons, which require that every contract of this kind entered into by the Government must be subject to the Rules of the House, and indeed to ratification by the House: and, as a matter of fact, the contract with the Marconi Company has in it a term that it is made subject to its being ratified by the House. All this paragraph at the end—and a matter which has given rise to a good deal of comment—entirely omits to take into account the fact that it relates to every contract of this kind, that it had to go before the House. It is only a provision in the contract, and therefore the statement that is made that "Mr. Maxse attacked at the same time the fact that the contract had been signed in haste on March 7 without having been brought before Parliament as it ought to have been," which,

of course, is only put there to back up the other statements, is entirely untrue. It was not signed in haste at all. It had been signed after all the negotiations I have stated, and the absolutely usual precedent was performed of having a completed contract first signed and then placed before the House of Commons. When this was accepted on March 7 every paper in the United Kingdom published either the day after or a day or two afterwards not only the fact of the contract, but most of the terms of it, and also published the fact that the contract could not become a binding contract until it had been ratified by Parliament, and the circular sent out by the Marconi Company themselves makes the very same statement which was here glossed over in this way by the libel, in suggesting that in some way or other through the secret machinations of the Postmaster-General and the Attorney-General, I suppose, Parliament was to be overridden and the ordinary rules of the House were not to be adhered to. There is not a particle of foundation for it from beginning to end. To complete the history of the matter, there was a formal contract entered into on July 19, that is, carrying out the matter—a formal matter. On the same day that the contract was signed it was laid on the table of the House, and it came before the House for consideration on August 7, when, my lord, there began to be objections to the contract, and, as the House was near adjournment for the holidays, the matter was postponed until the autumn session. Meanwhile these rumours began to circulate and these indefinite charges began to be made. People were led to believe that there was something wrong about the matter for some reason or other, and when it came before the House on October 11, the Government thought it right at once to put down the proposal to appoint a Select Committee of the House to report upon the circumstances of the negotiation and completion of the contract. That Committee sat last session and has been reappointed for this session, and it is right that I should say that the Postmaster-General and the Attorney-General intimated at once their desire to go before this Committee, and they were told that they would be summoned before the Committee when the proper time came. They have not yet been summoned before the Committee, and one can easily see that probably the reason is that as people are formulating, or are attempting to formulate, some kind of charges,

the Committee are probably waiting until these charges are formulated before they call upon these two Ministers. But, my lord, I desire to state they were both anxious at the earliest moment, and intimated that they were prepared at any moment to attend the Committee when they were summoned. May I say in one short sentence that as regards the negotiations, from the time they commenced, going back to the claim of the Marconi Company to the Colonial Office in 1910, down to the date of the completion of the matter, the Attorney-General from beginning to end had nothing whatsoever to say to the matter neither directly nor indirectly. One might imagine that he would have something to do with the form of the contract, or that it might be approved from its legal aspect or something like that. Nothing of that kind arose at all, and from beginning to end it was never submitted to him, nor had he ever any communication of any kind whatsoever with the Postmaster-General or anybody else in relation to the contract up to the date of its signing.

Now, my lord, the allegation in the libel: "All three had bought shares in the Company at an average price of about 50 francs at which these shares were quoted before the opening of the negotiations with the Government, and had re-sold them at a profit, rising to as much as 200 francs per share according as the negotiations enabled it to be foreseen that the contract would be concluded." Neither of these two gentlemen ever bought a share in this Company, either in their own name or in any other name, nor did anybody ever buy a share for them, nor were they ever interested in an option or a syndicate or any transaction whatsoever in relation to the shares of this Company. They will be examined and they will tell your lordship that that is so.

My lord, there were other Marconi Companies; there was the Canadian Marconi Company, and the Spanish Company, and although what I have said up to this entirely completes the matter as regards the proof of the falsehood of these statements, I must, my lord, having regard to one transaction in one of the Companies by the Attorney-General which it is necessary to explain, ask an indulgence, although it is a little outside the libel, so that there may be no confusion with reference to the matter in stating something about these other companies. The

other companies were the Canadian and Spanish companies. The shares of those two companies were being dealt with on the Stock Exchange here some time during that year, 1911 or 1912—I am not sure of the dates—and I think they were the only ones as regards these companies or as regards any other company. As regards the Postmaster-General, he never had a share at any time in any of them directly or indirectly. As regards these companies, up to March 7, the date that the tender was accepted, Sir Rufus Isaacs the Attorney-General had never had any dealing in any of them. The American Company, in which he had a subsequent dealing which I am going to state, which is an independent company, which could have no interest and has no interest in the contract at all, which merely erects these stations in America, which has no interest in the profits of the English Company, although the English Company has shares in it, subsequent to the acceptance of the tender proceeded to raise capital, having bought out certain interests in America, and made other arrangements there which required an extension of their capital. Even the suggestion of issuing shares did not come until a considerable time, some weeks, after the tender had been accepted in the English Company. Six weeks after the tender had been made public, the Attorney-General having heard of this American Company and of their shares—having heard of it, I think, for the first time a few days before—bought 10,000 of these shares at a premium which was the market price. There is one observation I desire to make. I have made perfectly clear the time at which what was done, which could have no reference whatsoever to the tender we have been talking about and no reference whatsoever to the Marconi Company that were dealing with the Government, I mean it being an entirely different company. But as there is a suggestion that in some way or other these gentlemen, or either of them, were dealing in the shares when they were low at 20 francs, and then sold them at 200 francs, may I say that at the time the Attorney-General bought these shares, the British Marconi Company's shares were up at the very highest figures that they had reached, so that any suggestion that the purchase of the American shares had anything to do with the price of these shares is entirely out of the question, because he had the good or the bad fortune—it does

not matter which so far as this is concerned—to buy these American shares at the time the British shares had reached the very highest point. As regards this deal which the Attorney-General had, this purchase of these 10,000 shares, in reality they turned out to be a loss to him. He sold some of the shares, and amongst others he sold 1000 to Mr. Lloyd George, and another 1000 to the Master of Elibank who is now Lord Murray, but who was then the Master of Elibank, who are two intimate friends of his own, and it is right to say that it was he who offered them the shares. Then at the time neither of them knew of the shares, probably had never heard of them, and the Attorney-General believing that they were a good investment, having nothing whatsoever to do with the shares in the British Company, offered them and they bought a thousand each.

I am afraid it also turned out a loss for them, but at all events as regards the Attorney-General, having sold those and some other shares, some of them at a profit, the net result is that he has still 6400 of the shares, and, taking the present price, he is a loser on the whole transaction of about £1000 to £1600. My lord, that is the vast fortune which he is alleged in many rumours to have made. I should only like to say this, that as regards his sales of some of these shares, they were done in the ordinary way by brokers on the Stock Exchange; there was no secrecy of any kind, nor was there any reason to have any secrecy. It passed through the books of these brokers, through their clerks and everybody else, and really the matter is so removed from the charges made in that libel that I only go into it at all—because of course it could be no justification for any statement in the libel—because of the position of the Attorney-General, and because he wishes in the fullest way to state this deal, so that it may not be said that he keeps anything whatsoever back. My lord, that is the whole matter. I am very anxious to examine both the Postmaster-General and Sir Rufus Isaacs. My friend Mr. Campbell is aware of all the facts that I have stated, because of course before *Le Matin* could be allowed or asked to make an apology of this kind, it was necessary that they should be informed of the whole facts so that, if they thought fit, they could challenge in any way any of the actions of those gentlemen in this court. Of course, on the statement of the facts that I have

given to you, if true—and they cannot be controverted—there is no possible foundation for any single statement which is made in this libel. I can only say, as I said before, that were it not that it was merely a French paper reporting gossip for no, as far as we can see, malicious or political purpose, we would be here upon the estimation of damages in relation to charges which I think are as gross as have ever been made against any public man.

Mr. Justice Darling: You have made your statement, Sir Edward, is your application that judgment should be entered, or what?

Sir Edward Carson: Judgment for the indemnity costs, my lord.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL, Sworn

Examined by *Mr. F. E. Smith*

Q. You are; as is well known, His Majesty's Postmaster-General, a Member of the Privy Council, a Cabinet Minister, and a Member of Parliament? *A.* I am.

Q. I think on February 14, or shortly afterwards, your attention was directed to the London telegram in *Le Matin* which has been read to my lord, by Sir Edward Carson? *A.* That is so.

Q. I want to ask you in the first place about the statement contained in that telegram that it was your idea to enter into the negotiations with the Company. Is there any foundation at all for that settlement? *A.* No, I did not initiate the proposal at all.

Q. Will you describe to me shortly the origin and the development in its early stages of the proposal? *A.* Shortly after I became Postmaster-General, at the beginning of 1910, I learned that the Marconi Company had applied to the Colonial Office for licences to erect a series of stations throughout the British Empire at their own cost to carry on wireless telegraphic communications. This application was referred to the Cable Landing Rights Committee of which the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade is the chairman, a Committee which is a Standing Committee and contains representatives of the Treasury, the Admiralty, the War Office, the Foreign Office, the Colonial Office, the India Office, the Board of Trade, and the Post Office. I am not a member of that Committee. The Committee considered

this application on several occasions at several sittings and ultimately came to the conclusion, in which the Post Office representative quite concurred, and in which I also concurred, that the stations should not be erected by a private company under licence, but ought to be erected by the Government of the United Kingdom and of India and of the Dominions and Colonies concerned.

Q. I think that report, just to get the chronological order, was made on May 19, 1911? *A.* That is so. Then the Imperial Conference was about to sit in June of that year, and the New Zealand Government had given notice of a resolution to the effect that it was very desirable that wireless stations should be erected in parts of the British Empire for the purposes of communications. Before the Conference sat it was thought desirable to have the opinion of the Committee of Imperial Defence upon the proposal, and the report of the Cable Landing Rights Committee was sent to the Committee of Imperial Defence which had previously appointed a standing sub-committtee to deal with wireless telegraphic questions. I was not a member again of that sub-committee. The chairman of it was the President of the Board of Trade, and it consisted, I think, of nine gentlemen representing all the various Departments of the Government that were interested. They reported on June 1, 1911, that a chain of stations to connect the United Kingdom with India and with Australia should be erected as soon as possible, and that negotiations ought to be entered into with the Marconi Company. The Cable Landing Rights Committee, I may add, had also recommended that negotiations should be entered into with the Marconi Company. Then the matter came before the Imperial Conference, of which I was a member.

Q. When did that meet? *A.* That was in June 1911, and that conference unanimously passed, with some slight verbal alterations, the resolution proposed by Sir Joseph Ward, the then Prime Minister of New Zealand. It was then for the first time that I took any personal part in the matter. I had previously approved the action of the Post Office representative on the Cable Landing Rights Committee, but it was only then that I began to enter into negotiations with the Company.

Q. At that time then you had the unanimous resolutions of the three bodies whose constitution and deliberation you have described? *A.* Yes, that is so.

Q. And what steps did you thereupon take? *A.* I thereupon took steps to form a special Committee to advise me in the matter which should contain other persons who were concerned besides those who served on the Cable Landing Rights Committee, and should devote themselves entirely to this particular question. I took the chair of that Committee, and it contained representatives of the Treasury and the other Government Departments concerned, and also some of the wireless experts attached to the Government Departments, and it contained also the High Commissioners of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Canada did not enter into the matter at all. At this first meeting on August 18, 1911, that Committee decided that the right course was to negotiate with the Marconi Committee. It considered the question of inviting tenders; it considered other possible alternatives; and it decided that the negotiations should be with the Marconi Company on the ground that we were informed by our experts that they alone had had practical experience of long-range commercial wireless telegraphy. Then some correspondence passed between the Post Office and the Company, and in December 1911 I made the acquaintance for the first time of Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, who was previously unknown to me, and who came to see me and the officers of my Department who were with me at the time on the subject of the terms to be agreed for the erection of these stations.

Q. With reference to the statement in the libel that you had entered into an arrangement with Sir Rufus Isaacs, have you any observation to make? *A.* I should like to state in the most unqualified manner that the Attorney-General did not exercise any influence in this matter, or attempt to exercise any influence whatsoever, at the initiation or in the course of the negotiations. He never discussed the subject with me or spoke to me about it, or wrote to me about it, or communicated with me through any third party with reference to it. He did not introduce Mr. Godfrey Isaacs to me, or in any manner whatsoever take any interest in the negotiations or in the contract

from first to last. Neither in his official nor in his private capacity did he intervene in any manner whatsoever.

Q. I will ask you a question now about the allegation in the libel that the contract had been signed in haste on March 7 without ever having been brought before Parliament, as it ought to have been. Was that true? *A*. That is totally untrue. In the first place the contract was not signed in haste, for the negotiations had been proceeding with the officers of my Department, and the other Government Departments had also been consulted throughout, for some months. The matter ought not to have been brought before the House of Commons at that stage, because the Standing Order of the House of Commons No. 78 requires that contracts of this nature shall be laid before the House of Commons when executed. The contract at that time had not been executed; the Company's tender had been accepted, but the details had still to be worked out, and a number of minor points had to be considered, and it was only on July 19 that the formal contract was signed by myself and by the Company.

Q. Taking it a little earlier in order, what was the date on which the Company sent in their tender? *A*. On February 18, 1912.

Mr. Justice Darling: Mr. Samuel, when you say the Order of the House of Commons requires that a contract shall not be submitted to the House until it has been executed, do you mean signed? *A*. Signed. I am using the actual words of the Standing Order.

Q. That is what I wanted to hear. Will you read the Standing Order? *A*. Certainly. Standing Order 72 describes the character of the contracts which require the approval of the House of Commons, within which category this contract comes. Standing Order 73 says: "Every such contract when executed shall forthwith, if Parliament be then sitting, or, if Parliament be not then sitting, within fourteen days after it assembles, be laid upon the table of the House, accompanied by a minute of the Lords of the Treasury setting forth the ground on which they have proceeded in authorising it."

Mr. F. E. Smith: I think I had better read No. 72 as well.

Sir Edward Carson: Not the whole of it.

A. "In all contracts extending over a period of years, and

creating a public charge, actual or prospective, entered into by the Government for the conveyance of mails by sea or for the purpose of telegraphic communications beyond sea, there shall be inserted the condition that the contract shall not be binding until it has been approved of by a resolution of the House," and that condition, of course, in the ordinary course appeared in the contract.

Mr. Justice Darling: Obviously, the House of Commons Standing Order uses the word "executed" with regard to a contract where we should use the word "signed". Really in a court like this "executed" means "performed."

Mr. F. E. Smith: You have told me that that tender was sent in by the Company on February 13, 1912. When was that tender answered? *A*. There were negotiations proceeding on certain points, and various modifications were arranged in the clauses of the tender, and it was accepted on March 7 by a letter which was sent by the Secretary to the Post Office, with the approval of myself and also with the approval of the Treasury, to the Company, showing that they accepted this tender.

Q. When the letter of March 7, of which you have spoken was sent, was the matter made public or not? *A*. Yes, it was at once made public in the Press.

Q. It was published in every paper? *A*. Yes, it was well known.

Q. The letter saying that the tender had been accepted subject to certain specified modifications? *A*. Yes.

Q. You have told me that the contract was signed on July 19, 1912, and I will ask you a general question on this: Was the course that was pursued in every respect consistent with the whole trend of Parliamentary precedent construed most strictly? *A*. Precisely, it was absolutely in accordance with all previous precedents relating to Post Office contracts. Indeed, it would have been contrary to all precedent, and I am not at all sure that it would have been in order to have presented the tender, and the letter accepting the tender, to Parliament in lieu of the contract itself.

Q. I want you to tell me next, if you will, to what bodies or to what Departments of the Government were the actual terms of the contract submitted and approved? *A*. The Cable Landing

Rights Committee was informed throughout of the course of the negotiations, and entirely concurred. The Special Committee which I formed was also consulted, but the actual terms of the contract were not laid before it, because it had approved of the general outlines of the contract, and the terms themselves were submitted to the various Departments and Governments concerned in the contract, and whose representatives served upon that committee. It was not necessary for the committee to be consulted, as the various Departments whose representatives made up the Committee were directly consulted. The Treasury, the Colonial Office, the India Office, the War Office, the Admiralty, and the High Commissioner of South Africa were all communicated with, and the actual terms of the contract itself submitted to them, and they all expressed their approval.

Q. To complete the history, you told me the contract was signed on July 19. I believe on the same day it was laid on the table of the House. On August 7 it came before the House, and the matter was postponed until October 11 on which day the Committee was appointed, to which my friend Sir Edward Carson referred? *A*. Yes, that is so, and I should like to say that I, personally, was exceedingly anxious that the contract should come before the House at the earliest possible moment after July 19, and pressed for it on several occasions. It was only the pressure of other business that made that possible.

Q. I might as well deal with the Committee and ask you this; I think you indicated at a very early stage your willingness, and, indeed, your desire, to go before the Committee at any moment which, with regard to the Order of Discussions, might be convenient. *A*. Yes, certainly, but I was given to understand by the chairman of the Committee that the Committee had considered their own procedure and that they had decided that they would prefer to hear first any persons who might desire to make charges against members of the Government, and to call members of the Government, so far as necessary, to rebut any charges that might be made.

Q. Just for clearness, I think you went before the Committee on some technical point only? *A*. Yes, some subordinate point.

Q. I want to direct your attention next to the statement in the libel: "All three . . . had bought shares in the Company

[illegible] at an average price of about 50 francs, at which these shares were quoted before the opening of the negotiations with the Government, and had resold them at a profit rising to as much as 200 francs per share according as the negotiations enabled it to be foreseen that the contract would be concluded." Have you any observation to make upon that? *A*. I desire to state with regard to that, that I have never at any time bought or sold, or possessed, any share in this or any other wireless telegraphy company; that I have had no interest, direct or indirect, of any kind whatsoever in any Marconi Company; that I have never indirectly been connected with any purchase or any sale of any such shares; that no one ever suggested to me that I should invest in this Company, or invited me to do so. I should like to add further that, so far as I am aware, no relative of mine has ever purchased any shares in this Company. I, of course, cannot speak with positive knowledge with respect to the investments of any members of my family, but I have never heard that any of them contemplated investing, or had invested, in any such shares, and I have no reason whatever to suppose that any of them have ever done so.

Q. Did you ever suggest to any one that they should invest in this or any other Company? *A*. Never on any occasion. No relative or friend of mine has ever sought my advice with regard to investing in the shares of this or any other Marconi . . .

Mr. Justice Darling: There is nothing about this in the paper, Mr. Smith.

Mr. F. E. Smith: Then I will not pursue it any further. (To the Witness.) If any one can suggest a more explicit form of denial you would be pleased to substitute it for your own? *A*. I should indeed. I desire to make it in as unqualified terms as it is possible for any man to use.

SIR RUFUS ISAACS, Sworn. Examined by *Sir Edward Carson*.

Q. You, as we know, are his Majesty's Attorney-General, you are a Privy Councillor, a member of the House of Commons and a member of the Cabinet? *A*. Yes.

Q. You are the brother of Mr. Godfrey Issacs, who is the Managing Director of the Marconi Company? *A*. Yes, he is my younger brother.

Q. Just to have the date, was he Manager of the Company before you ever became Solicitor-General, which was your first appointment? *A.* Yes, he became Managing Director of the Company in January of 1910. I took office by becoming Solicitor-General about the middle of March 1910, caused by the vacancy when Lord Mersey resigned the Presidency of the Probate and Divorce Division.

Q. With reference to the statement in the article which you have seen in *Le Matin*, is there any truth in the statement that you entered into an arrangement with the Postmaster-General with reference to the Marconi business? *A.* I never had anything to do with the negotiations for the contract; I never knew the negotiations, I knew nothing of the Committees; the matter never came before me in any shape or form, I was never consulted about it, and from first to last I have never had any conversation either with Mr. Herbert Samuel or with anybody else in the Government or with any official, or with any person with reference to this contract, until just a few days before the announcement was made, that is before March 8, 1912, at a family function—my brother told me that he expected or hoped, within the next few days, to get a contract with the Government. That was the first intimation I had that he was in negotiation for it. I paid no particular attention to it. There the matter ended, so far as I was concerned.

Q. Had you anything to do whatsoever with these preliminary Committees that investigated the matter that I have gone through? *A.* I never knew of their existence until this discussion first arose in the House of Commons with reference to the Marconi contract, that is July and August 1912 [*sic*]. I mean of their existence in reference to this Marconi contract. Of course I knew of the Imperial Defence, and Committees of that kind, but I did not know they had anything whatever to do with it.

Q. And I dare say you knew there was an Imperial Conference? *A.* Yes, I even had to attend it, and I also knew that this matter of the Imperial wireless chain had been discussed at the Imperial Conference. I knew that.

Q. Now as regards the statement made in the libel, it says: "All three had bought shares in the Company at an average price of about 50 francs." *A.* I never bought a share in the Marconi Company either before or after, or at any time. I have

never held a share. I have never had any interest in a share, either directly or indirectly; I have never had an interest in any option; I have never had an interest in any syndicate, and I do not know what other particular form might be suggested of an interest in shares, but whatever it is, I had not it, and never had it.

Q. Then it is suggested that you bought at an average price of 50 francs, and that you sold at 200 francs. Did you ever sell any? *A*. No, I neither bought nor sold. Might I add also, with reference to the answer I just gave, so that there may be no misapprehension, that I neither did this in my own name nor anybody else's name, and in fact to my knowledge and recollection, and certainly for the last twenty years, I have never done a transaction in a nominee's name at all, whatever I have done has been in my own name in the ordinary way, openly.

Q. In addition there is just one question I should like to ask you, having regard to your official position. Have you ever advised any one with reference to these shares? *A*. Never.

Q. Now up to the time of the acceptance of the tender, had you ever had any dealing in any of the other Marconi Companies? *A*. No, there were only two, I think, if there were more I know nothing about them, but there were two which I saw quoted, that is the Spanish and the Canadian, but I never had any transaction, either before or since, in either of these Companies.

Q. There is an American Company? *A*. Yes.

Q. So far as you know, up till that date, March 7, was there any dealing or quotation in these shares? *A*. Of the American Company?

Q. Had you ever known of them? *A*. I never heard of them till April.

Q. Is that that you never heard of the American Company at all until April? *A*. Well, I am not quite sure whether it was a Company. I knew, of course, that there was some working of the Marconi system in America, whether it was under the English Company or a separate company I did not know. I knew that Mr. Marconi and my brother went out there at some time in March. I knew after they had gone, but I never heard of the shares or the constitution of the company in America until my brother returned, and he returned, I think, on April 8 or 9, 1912.

Q. Did you then learn that the American Company was issuing shares to raise new capital? *A.* Yes. He told me of the various arrangements that had been made over there, and that it would be necessary to raise a capital, or had been necessary to issue shares to the amount of £1,400,000 to carry out some special arrangements that had been made for the purchase of the assets of another company, a competing company, the United Wireless Company, which had gone into liquidation in America, and also some important arrangements that had been made.

Q. Contracts? *A.* Contracts with the Western Union Cable Company.

Q. We need not go into the details. *A.* No, he told me of that.

Q. At any rate, he told you of certain developments that had taken place in the American Company? *A.* Yes.

Q. As regards the American Company, had they any interest in the profits of the Marconi Company? *A.* Oh no, they had nothing whatever to do with the Marconi Company in the sense of sharing the profits or having any interest in the profits of the Marconi Company. They were a separate concern to work the invention of Marconi in the United States within the territorial limits of the United States.

Q. Then having heard of these shares in the month of April as you say, did you, to pass over some matters, eventually buy 10,000 of them? *A.* I did.

Q. Do you remember what date? *A.* April 17, just about six weeks after the announcement of the contract.

Q. Did you buy them at a premium? *A.* Yes.

Q. According to the market rate? *A.* At the market rate, and I may say that I satisfied myself before I did that, that they had no interest of any sort or kind with the British Government. I made quite clear about that.

Q. That follows from what you have said before? *A.* Yes.

Q. With reference to the shares of the Marconi Company at that date, you told us you had no interest in them? *A.* No.

Q. Had you looked at that date to see what price they had reached? *A.* Yes, I looked at it purposely. They had reached then 9¾, which is the highest price that they ever did touch. They had gone up from something like £4 10s. a share I think on March 7 or March 8, at which they were, and then for various

reasons which I cannot of course go into, they had gone to the price of $9\frac{1}{16}$ and $9\frac{3}{4}$, which was the highest price they had ever touched, and they had reached that by April 17.

Q. All that I want to show is that your purchase in the American Company had nothing to do with raising them up to that price. *A*. Oh no, nothing whatever.

Q. Now as regards the shares you bought, you sold some of them? *A*. Yes.

Q. Did you sell 1000 to Mr. Lloyd George? *A*. Yes.

Q. And 1000 to the Master of Elibank? *A*. Yes.

Q. Just tell us what happened? *A*. I was living on very intimate terms with them. We were great personal friends and are, and I told them what I had done. I told them I knew about the American Company, and I told them of course that I should not have gone into it unless I was satisfied that it had nothing whatever to do with the Marconi Company, or with any contract which either had been made, or might be made, with the British Government; they were entirely independent. I told them that I thought it was a very good investment, and I told them exactly what I had done, the price that I had paid, and I told them that if they liked they could take from me 1000 shares each at the same price that I had paid for them.

Q. So far as you know, had either of them known anything of the American Company until then? *A*. I do not think so. I do not think they had ever heard of it. I am quite sure they never would have gone into it if it had not been for what I told them.

Q. Now you sold some of the other shares at a premium? *A*. Yes.

Q. As a result, you have at present about 6400 of your original purchase? *A*. Yes. I sold 3570. That sale averaged a profit —which eventually brings the whole transaction, my having now 6430 left of the 10,000—the net result of the transaction is that at the present prices I have a loss of somewhere about £1100 or £1200, if I sold the shares at the present moment that would be the result. That, of course, applies to the whole 10,000.

Q. And that is the net result of the one deal? *A*. Yes, that is the net result of all the transactions that I have ever had either in Marconi, or in any other wireless enterprise.

Q. I do not know whether you know whether the Chancellor

of the Exchequer or Lord Murray made a large emolument? ...
They stand in about the same position, of course, that they have lost a few hundreds each.

Sir Edward Carson: That is all I have to say.

Mr. Campbell: My lord, I appear with my friend Mr. Schiller on behalf of the Defendants in each of these actions. My lord, they are the proprietors of this newspapsr *Le Matin*, a newspaper which, as your lordship may be probably aware, is one of the highest possible character and reputation, occupying in its own country a position somewhat analogous to that which the *Times* occupies in ours. The efforts of the Defendants have always been directed to fostering in every way the most friendly relations with the people of this country, and the very last thing that they would desire or wish, would be to place themselves in any way in antagonism to any section of the people of this country, and certainly last and least of all to reflect, either unfairly or injuriously, upon the character of any gentlemen filling the high position of members of his Majesty's Government.

I should like to explain how this publication came to be made, because I wish to get rid entirely of a suggestion that my clients understand has been made, that this publication was inspired from outside. There is not one particle of foundation of any sort or kind for that suggestion. The day before this publication appeared, and for a considerable time previously, there had been a good deal of discussion in this country and abroad in reference to this Marconi contract. It had formed the subject-matter of debate in the House of Commons, and a Parliamentary Committee was actually sitting at the time investigating the matter. On the preceding day a gentleman named Maxse, the editor of the *National Review*, had been examined and had made certain statements, and that night the London agent of *Le Matin* at the London office directed one of his staff to prepare a summary of Mr. Maxse's statement before the Committee, so that he might telegraph it to *Le Matin* in Paris. The member of the staff in the preparation of that summary blundered into the use of language which undoubtedly was calculated to convey, and did convey, a very grave and serious charge against each of these two Plaintiffs, because it in effect alleged that they had utilised their high official position and knowledge as members of the Government for the purpose of speculating in the shares of this particular British

Marconi Company at the time that that Company was negotiating with their Government for this contract. My lord, that is, as I have said, a very grave and a very serious charge, and the moment the attention of my clients was turned to it, they met it with an immediate apology and attempted explanation, and when they were challenged by the writs in this action, they put upon record also the expression of their regret. Now, my lord, each of these two distinguished gentlemen who are the plaintiffs in this action has gone into the witness-box and has repudiated and denied the imputation that is contained in that telegram—denied it upon oath. I, my lord, need hardly say that on behalf of my clients I unreservedly accept that denial and repudiation, and I tender to each of those gentlemen, on behalf of my clients, a renewed expression of their unqualified regret, and the fullest apology for having circulated the imputation calculated to cause such pain and injury.

There is just one other matter, my lord, to which I must refer because I am anxious to avoid, if I can, that there should be any possible misconception in the future as to the attitude of my clients. I refer to certain statements made by Sir Rufus Isaacs in the box with regard to some transaction with another company. It obviously is no part of my duty as Counsel for the defendants, to offer any comment of any kind in reference to that, but it is right that I should repeat what has been already referred to by my learned friend Sir Edward Carson, namely, that some few days ago, acting as I think with most perfect good faith and with the strictest professional propriety, he informed me of the substance and effect of that statement in order that I might communicate it to my clients so that they might be in possession of those facts before they came to a final determination with regard to their position in this action. I accordingly conveyed that information to my clients, but they, feeling satisfied, and I think rightly so, that nothing which has been said here to-day, or nothing in the information so conveyed to them, has in the slightest degree relieved them, so far as these proceedings are concerned or this action is concerned, from their full legal responsibility in respect of the publication that is complained of and challenged in these actions, they desire me, and I do so at their request, again to repeat their expression of very great regret, and to tender to each of

these gentlemen their full and complete apology for having made charges and insinuations against them which are absolutely devoid of foundation and fact, and to explain to the court and to your lordship the circumstances under which this publication was made. I have nothing further to say except to add that in what I have said I have followed to the letter the instructions of my clients.

The only other matter that I should add is that we have agreed, as Sir Edward Carson has said, to give to each of these gentlemen, the plaintiffs in these actions, the fullest indemnity in regard to the costs of the proceedings, and may I, on their behalf and as my own personal expression, say that I think the plaintiffs under the circumstances have treated the defendants with consideration and generosity.

Sir Edward Carson : Then, my lord, there will be judgment for the plaintiffs.

Mr. Justice Darling : Judgment for the plaintiffs in each case for indemnity costs. That is an agreed amount, is it ?

Sir Edward Carson : No, my lord, I have not agreed the amount.

Mr. Justice Darling : Whatever it comes to—indemnity costs.

Sir Edward Carson : Yes, there will be no difficulty.

Mr. Justice Darling : Probably it is expected that I should say a word upon the manner in which this case is concluded, but, as I understand Sir Edward Carson, Mr. Samuel and Sir Rufus Isaacs still are in the position that they probably will be called as witnesses before the Committee appointed by Parliament.

Sir Edward Carson : Probably, my lord, I think so.

Mr. Justice Darling : At all events, they offer themselves as witnesses.

Sir Edward Carson : Yes.

Mr. Justice Darling : They expect to be called ?

Sir Edward Carson : Yes. my lord.

Mr. Justice Darling : And for all you know, they will be called. In those circumstances I do not think it would be to the public advantage that I should express any opinion whatever. I think I ought to treat a Committee of the House of Commons as a judge of this court would expect proceedings in

this court to be treated, proceedings which were pending, and not to have an outside tribunal express any opinion as to matters which are about to come before this court. Although I know a Committee of the House of Commons is not in the position of the Court of King's Bench, I shall extend to them as a courtesy what with regard to the Court of King's Bench is a right.

With regard to the defendant newspaper, I merely desire to say this: I must know, as many people must know, the truth of what was mentioned by Mr. Campbell, that this is a newspaper of very high repute in France, and that it is a paper which has devoted itself for a considerable time to making French people acquainted with the affairs of this country, in the hope that the French and English peoples may better understand one another. In what is complained of by the plaintiffs, they reported as a scandal which occupied the English Press, what they intended to be a fair summary of the proceedings before the Parliamentary Committee the day Mr. Maxse had given his evidence. As they explained, the next day, when it was pointed out to them that what had passed before that Committee really did not justify what they had said concerning the Attorney-General and the Postmaster-General, they then immediately pointed out that they, on looking into the matter, saw that the official documents did not in any manner confirm the rumours to which they had given publicity, and they immediately expressed as fully as they were able their regret that they had given an inaccurate version of what was occupying undoubtedly the public mind and the public Press in this country. They have also upon their pleadings made the fullest possible withdrawal. It was very natural that, holding such positions as they do, the two plaintiffs should desire to state in open court fully all that concerned this investigation. Although it was not necessary to do it, because the defendants were in no way justified, it was to the public advantage that they should be allowed to make those statements, and, as I say, I hope it will not be misunderstood if I express no opinion and do not say a word by way of comment; it is not that I actually do not hold an opinion, but that I do not in the least wish to appear to interfere with an investigation which is going on before a Committee of the House of Commons.

II

COLLAPSE OF CÆSAR'S WIFE

IT would be impossible to exaggerate the sensation caused by the foregoing case, which was all the greater owing to the positive and reiterated assertions of faithful Ministerial organs that all other litigation and litigants had been set aside, in order that our unimpeachable Attorney-General should be afforded the earliest possible opportunity of clearing himself of the malicious and mendacious rumours circulated by ill-disposed persons, suggesting that Ministers had actually purchased Marconi shares. On a particular day the case was mentioned in the Courts, and a special day was allotted to the leader of the British Bar, who would enjoy all the advantage of a bloodless victory—undisturbed by cross-examination—as it was known that the defendants—*Le Matin*—were prepared to withdraw and apologise for their preposterous and groundless assertions. Thus the road would be open to the Lord Chief Justiceship, to which Sir Rufus Isaacs had already been appointed by Coalition organs—plus the *Daily Telegraph*.

In order to make assurance doubly sure the Attorney-General and the Postmaster-General had taken the precaution to requisition two of their most formidable political opponents, Sir Edward Carson—the Ulster Leader—and Mr. F. E. Smith—whose forensic talents would thus be at the service of Ministers at the hearing, while, in the event of any contretemps, their subsequent silence would be secured, as it is alleged to be contrary to the etiquette of the all-powerful Trade Union of the Law for "gentlemen of the long robe," as they were habitually described by Disraeli, to act politically in a matter in which they had appeared professionally. That was a stroke of Semitic slimness beyond praise. Much capital was made by the Radical Press out of the association of these eminent advocates with their distinguished clients, the innocent being invited to infer that there could be nothing wrong with a cause espoused by a Unionist ex-Attorney-General and a future Unionist Cabinet Minister. The Trade Union code is severe. Workmen break it at their peril. So we are told would

lawyers with the courage to make the attempt. Hence this strange and not very edifying spectacle of two prominent and effective members of the Opposition being put *hors de combat* politically, in order that the honour of the Coalition may be vindicated. It is alleged, rightly or wrongly, that the Attorney-General's retainer to any member of the Bar is a command that none dare disobey. Does the same observation apply to the Postmaster-General? It may be all in accordance with Trade Union etiquette, and yet we cannot resist the conclusion that, had the parts been reversed, had the Radicals been in Opposition, and a Unionist Government in a very tight place, Ministers would never have got Radicals of the standing of Sir Edward Carson and Mr. F. E. Smith to devote their talents to the Ministerial cause if a Unionist Attorney-General and a Unionist Postmaster-General were involved in an issue of the magnitude of the Marconi mystery, upon which the very existence of the Cabinet was at stake. On one pretext or another Radical barristers would have evaded the invidious task, and we must express the regret of every single Unionist we have consulted that our Front Bench lawyers should have allowed themselves to be enticed into such a palpable trap. The plain man is already sufficiently suspicious of politics and politicians, and this episode but serves to deepen his contempt for the whole game. It was, no doubt, professionally correct, just as it is a public disaster.

Of zeal there was abundance. According to the Radical *Westminster Gazette*, "For nearly an hour Sir Edward Carson, as vehement in the defence of his political foes as though they both held high commissions in his Ulster Army, spoke, summarising in deliberate, carefully chosen words, the whole history of the transaction between the Government and the Marconi Company, so far as it concerned Mr. Herbert Samuel and Sir Rufus Isaacs." Having undertaken the case Sir Edward Carson only did his duty in doing his best for his clients. No one will grumble over that. But one is entitled to enquire whether the etiquette of his Trade Union equally required Sir Edward Carson to be unfair to other people whose names were taken in vain in this case, who were not parties to it, and were afforded no opportunity of appearing, as they received no intimation of the nature of the libels which had moved two Cabinet Ministers to tardy action.

Our readers had before them last month the complete evidence given by the Editor of the *National Review* at the Marconi Committee, together with the full cross-examination, as published by the Committee in a Special Report presented to the House of Commons with a view to getting the witness imprisoned for refusing to betray confidences. The libel in the present case, which appeared in *Le Matin* of February 14, did not bear the faintest resemblance to that evidence of which it was not a translation, or even a travesty. It was an invention, pure and simple, as the reader can see for himself who is at pains to compare the statement of the *Matin* with the Special Report of the Marconi Committee. There is not the necessary space to reprint what was reproduced *in extenso* in last month's *National Review*, as there are more important questions to discuss. I need only say that I expressly exonerated Mr. Herbert Samuel from rumours of speculating in Marconi shares, so far as they had reached me, and I pointed out as regards the period prior to the Agreement of March 7, "Sir Rufus Isaacs had no right to resent any suggestion that he might have speculated in Marconi shares, for the simple reason that he informed the House that he never even knew the Marconi Company was dealing with the Government until the eve of the acceptance of the tender in the beginning of March last year, which he only learnt from his brother at some social function." His offences were different. I made none of the statements put into my mouth by *Le Matin*, as Sir Edward Carson and Mr. F. E. Smith were aware, because, as Members of Parliament, they had this evidence before them. And yet, throughout his hour's opening speech for the plaintiffs, Sir Edward Carson—as our readers can see from the verbatim report on a previous page—never so much as mentioned the fact that the *Matin's* version of my evidence before the Marconi Committee was a fabrication from beginning to end, and casual readers of that speech might gather from its tone and temper that the action was brought against the *National Review* rather than *Le Matin*. This was doubtless strictly professional, or the ex-Attorney-General would not have done it. It was also a great convenience to the plaintiffs and provided pabulum for their Press, though neither the one nor the other stand to score in the long run. Nor did the Counsel for *Le Matin* contribute towards removing the misrepresentation. He also was too preoccupied in

vindicating the fair fame of the Attorney-General and his brilliant colleague at the Post Office, and it was not until the Judge's brief comments at the conclusion of this extraordinary case that the truth leaked out.

This may be all according to Cocker, but it strikes the ignoramus as being anything but "cricket." It leaves me no option but to make these distasteful remarks. Otherwise, readers of this Review might be puzzled by the proceedings, all the more so as Sir Alfred Moritz Mond's organ, the *Westminster Gazette*, has taken advantage of the misleading manner in which the case was presented to publish characteristically fatuous observations including a challenge which I accept with eagerness and enthusiasm. In the first place, "the sea-green, incorruptible" organ of an unblemished Radical plutocracy applauds Sir Rufus Isaacs for "very properly" disclosing "one investment which he, and, at his suggestion, Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Murray" (our old friend, the Master of Elibank, who so prudently, if precipitately, withdrew from public life last year in order to enter the oil trade) "made in the American Marconi Company, a company which has no interest in the profits of the British company or in its dealings with the British Government." Ministers are, none the less, informed by the *Westminster Gazette*, "that they ought to have appreciated the misconceptions that might arise out of the common name of the two companies. It may be said that they would have done wiser to disclose this incident." Why should they have disclosed what is *ex hypothesi* a perfectly irrelevant incident? If the American Marconi Company have no further connection with the British Marconi Company beyond the common name, as the *Westminster Gazette* insinuates, why waste the time of the Commons or a Court in discussing it? However, our contemporary is uneasy, like many others now anxious to belittle that wonderful enterprise the American Marconi Company. It admits that such criticism is "legitimate enough, though, on the other hand, there is much to be said for the view that the proper place for a disclosure of this kind was either before the House of Commons Committee, or before a Court of Law *where statements can be made on oath*" (our italics). The suggestion that his Majesty's Ministers are only to be believed when speaking on oath is scarcely flattering either to them or the House

of Commons. But let that pass. Then comes the challenge which we gather from earlier passages in this specious article is issued to the *National Review*.

> There is one form of comment which . . . is not legitimate. That is, while accepting unreservedly the admission of the *Matin* that the charge of corruption is without foundation, and that the fact of the American investment offered not the slightest justification for it, to go on to say that this investment nevertheless offers a justification or excuse for the original authors of the libel. The real state of the case is the exact contrary. The American investment offers not a plank, not even a tight-rope, for the retreat of those who have charged corruption; and we cannot imagine their appealing for indulgence on that ground.

I never felt less in need of "a plank," or "a tight-rope," or any method of "retreat" or plea for indulgence, as, so far from retreating with the aid of the American investment from anything I have written in the *National Review*, or stated before the Marconi Committee—with the assertions of the *Matin*, serious students of the Marconi mystery have no concern—I propose to use the American investment as a battering-ram to smash the vast superstructure of mystification and falsification which has been elaborately reared by interested parties, to conceal from the country the gross improprieties of which Ministers have been avowedly guilty.

Much might be said, and will be said, upon the subject of Mr. Samuel, the Postmaster-General, for the deplorable manner in which the Marconi agreement was negotiated—a transaction which was marred by every conceivable form of folly—and upon his studious efforts to mislead the House of Commons and withhold the terms of a monstrous compact. His ineptitude undoubtedly promoted the schemes of speculators "in the know" to enrich themselves at the expense of less fortunate persons. The Marconi Boom was a scandalous incident—occurring, as it did, during confidential negotiations between the company and the Post Office—which any intelligent Postmaster-General could at any moment have nipped in the bud. I am glad to have my surmise confirmed by the oath of the Postmaster-General, that he has never speculated in any shares in any Marconi Company. In the categorical rumours that reached me from many quarters to the effect that in spite of their indignant repudiations and the hysterical fury of the Coalition Press, Ministers had bought

Marconi shares—which have now been confirmed by Sir Rufus Isaacs' sworn testimony—Mr. Herbert Samuel's name did not figure. I am not surprised to hear, and unreservedly accept his declaration, that he kept clear of all Marconi speculations. On the other hand, I was unaware that the late Chief Whip of the Radical Party was a holder of Marconi shares. Mr. Samuel's weakness for the Marconi Company, which received exceptionally tender treatment from the Post Office, must be regarded as one of those official obsessions to which arrogant bureaucrats are prone. One day I hope to tell the story of the negotiation of the agreement, which is as amazing as anything else in this amazing affair. It will scarcely be believed until it is seen in print, fortified by quotations from the official evidence. Apart from his deplorable diplomacy and childish secretiveness towards the House of Commons and the country, Mr. Samuel is also guilty of what used to be regarded as the serious offence, even when unintentional, of misleading Parliament and the public on a matter of moment. Speaking as the mouthpiece of the Government during the fateful Marconi debate last October (October 11) the Postmaster-General made this comprehensive declaration which sounded well, and read well, at the time, though it is less impressive to-day.

I confess that, after reading for months past allegations, insinuations, attacks, accusations of maladministration and favouritism, and even worse, it is to me a relief to stand at this table in the light of day, and give an answer to these assertions. I should like, in the first instance, to confirm, in unqualified terms, what has been said on his own behalf by my right hon. and learned friend the Attorney-General (Sir Rufus Isaacs) and I can do it not only on my behalf, but on that of every member of the Cabinet. I say that these stories that members of the Cabinet, knowing the contract was in contemplation, and feeling that possibly the prices of shares might rise themselves, directly or indirectly, bought any of those shares, or took any interest in this company through any other party whatever, have not one syllable of truth in them. Neither I myself nor any of my colleagues have at any time held one shilling's worth of shares in this company, directly or indirectly, or have derived one penny profit from the fluctuations in their prices. It seems shameful that political feeling can carry so far, that lying tongues can be found to speak and ears found to listen to such wicked and utterly baseless slanders such as these. This Committee [*i.e.* the Marconi Committee] which will be appointed will enquire into every aspect of this question, and members of the Government will be most ready to appear before it. Every member of the House may have full confidence that while every part of this transaction will come under the searchlight of examination, it will be shown that there is no uncleanness in any quarter.

It would be difficult to frame a more comprehensive or explicit statement. As was at once pointed out in the *National Review* it was too comprehensive; the Postmaster-General could not possibly be acquainted with the private affairs of all his colleagues. It now turns out to have been too explicit. It was interpreted as signifying that no Cabinet Minister was interested in any Marconi shares. In view of the intimate relations prevailing between Mother Marconi—the prolific parent and her lusty offspring—he conveyed the suggestion that none of his colleagues had at any time held any shares in any Marconi Company. He spoke in ignorance of the fact, which has already transpired—and we may be only at the beginning of sensational revelations—that the Attorney-General had held no less than 10,000 shares on privileged terms in the American Marconi Company, of which he had generously disposed of 1000 to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and 1000 to the then Chief Whip of the Ministerial Party on the same terms. Mr. Samuel must, *ex hypothesi*, have been misled by his colleagues when he hazarded this suggestion, as presumably he would not have done so without individually cross-examining those on whose behalf he purported to speak. In spite of the "Hush-Up" Press, the public are entitled to know what Mr. Samuel asked Sir Rufus Isaacs, and what Sir Rufus Isaacs told Mr. Samuel. What, again, had passed between Mr. Samuel and Mr. Lloyd George and other Ministers, whose names have not been mentioned in print, in reference to these rumours, though they are freely bruited abroad.

The question is of capital and primary importance, because we are dealing with credit and character, "the personal honour"—to use the favourite phrase of the Coalition Press—of "our public men, of whom we are justly proud in this country," to quote the Chairman of the Marconi Select Committee (Sir Albert Spicer).

It would be impossible to imagine a more vital issue, however little it may appeal to a callous and cynical Prime Minister. Mr. Samuel's testimony, which it is desirable to secure at the earliest possible moment, under circumstances which will render cross-examination possible, is all-important for another reason. You cannot "fob off" the Postmaster-General with the legend now for the first time being "fobbed off" on the Coalition Press, and the Hush-Up Press of nominally Unionist proclivities, that,

as the negotiations between the Marconi Company and the British Government were concluded by the agreement of March 7, any Ministerial Marconi speculation occurring in April, being clear of the contract, is unobjectionable. We all know that the Attorney-General has insistently treated the agreement of March 7 as "the Contract," but the sole defence of the Postmaster-General—on this matter the mouthpiece of the Government—for keeping the House of Commons in the dark on the Marconi arrangement from March until July, was that "the Contract" was not completed until July 19, and that it could not be communicated to the House until that date, as it would have been contrary to all precedent to communicate a Contract that was not a Contract and an Agreement that was not an Agreement. As Ministers must stand or fall by the attitude of the Postmaster-General, and as he escaped cross-examination during the *Matin* case, this must be made clear, so that all who run may read. Remember that the Attorney-General's notorious transaction in American Marconi shares occurred on April 17, 1912, in his own (Sir Rufus Isaacs') words "just about six weeks after the announcement of the Contract" (*i.e.* the agreement of March 7 between the Marconi Company and the British Government), though why stress should be laid on this "six weeks" if there be no connection between the American and the British Companies is not obvious. But, according to the Postmaster-General, there was no Contract at this time, as may be gathered from Mr. Samuel's dialogue with Sir Henry Norman in the House of Commons on October 11. I quoted it last month. I quote it again. It is infinitely more important to-day. Sir Henry Norman, in opening the Marconi debate, said:

On March 7 the Postmaster-General signed an agreement with Marconi's Wireless Company for the erection of six wireless stations.

Mr. Herbert Samuel: There is no agreement.

Sir H. Norman: I will adopt whatever word the Postmaster-General chooses. He approved and signed a contract.

Mr. Herbert Samuel: No, sir. I signed no contract. The Marconi Company put in a tender in general terms. A letter was written by the Post Office accepting the tender, upon which a contract was subsequently to be based.

Sir H. Norman: I will make myself entirely safe by saying that the Postmaster-General signed a document.

Mr. Herbert Samuel: Somebody wrote a letter.

Sir H. Norman: Really, if I may respectfully say so, that is rather a quibble. Some document committing the Post Office, and therefore the British Government, to the erection of these wireless stations, subject to the ratification of this House, was signed by somebody on March 7 on behalf of the Postmaster-General.

Mr. Herbert Samuel: There was no contract.

This was no casual interpretation or afterthought. It was the essence of the case for the Post Office and the Government throughout their strange silence last spring and summer, and I could give several quotations in support of it at need. During his speech on October 11, Mr. Samuel defended himself for not disclosing the arrangement of March 7 to the House of Commons on the specific ground that "it was not a Contract, it was merely the acceptance of a preliminary tender."

Although the story is intricate it is fascinating, and I would beg the reader's close attention in order that he may fully appreciate the moral importance—and a great moral issue is at stake, viz. the relations between our public men and the public—of the controversy opened by the American Marconi deal "six weeks after the announcement of the Contract," which the Postmaster-General never announced *ex hypothesi* because there was no contract. Note Mr. Samuel's further statement in the House of Commons in the same Marconi debate (October 11, 1912), "What happened after that (*i.e.* after the acceptance of the Marconi Company's tender on March 7) was that a most elaborate series of communications and conferences went on between the various Departments concerned, particularly the Admiralty, the War Office, the Colonial Office, the *Treasury* (our italics), and the Post Office, and the Solicitors were employed to work out the details of this Contract." In the next illuminating sentence, Mr. Samuel stated "Much to my regret, it was not until July that the Contract was completed. Although personally I pressed it forward as much as I could, the various Departments could not come to terms with themselves or with the Company on the outstanding parts." As we have been told, and we accept it unreservedly, the Attorney-General was never consulted at any stage of the proceedings, but the public were unaware of the fact that our helpless Post Office was deprived of the services of the principal Law Officer until October, and naturally believed that his advice would be sought on a question bristling with legal problems. Even if Sir Rufus Isaacs' view be correct—

and no layman would contest such a point with him—that the Contract was virtually completed in March—in which case the Postmaster-General is damned for mystifying and misleading the House of Commons—we have the explicit and uncontradicted statement of Mr. Samuel, that several Departments including *the Treasury* were quarrelling over the Marconi Contract until the month of July. Now, according to the sworn testimony of Sir Rufus Isaacs, the head of the Treasury his "intimate" friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Lloyd George, had been a shareholder in the American Marconi Company since April, *i.e.* according to Mr. Samuel, during the negotiations between the Government and the British Marconi Government. If there was virtue in the Attorney-General's waiting until "six weeks after the announcement of the Contract" in March—a contract in which he had had no hand—before plunging in American Marconis, what becomes of Mr. Lloyd George, whose Department participated in Marconi negotiations until July, two months after the Chancellor of the Exchequer had become a substantial holder of Marconi shares? 1000 American Marconis were worth £4000 on April 19, if intelligently realised.

Nevertheless, Mr. Lloyd George permitted himself to tell the House of Commons on October 11 "the reason why the *Government wanted a frank discussion before going to Committee* was because we wanted to bring here these rumours, these sinister rumours, that have been passed from one foul lip to another behind the backs of the House." Public opinion will surely demand that the entire Cabinet, and indeed the whole Ministry, parade before the Marconi Select Committee and disclose the full extent of any speculations in which they may have indulged in person or by proxy in any Marconi Company. Sir Edward Carson, plaintiffs' Counsel in the action against the *Matin*, informed the Court, as may be gathered from a preceding page, "When this (*i.e.* the Marconi Company's tender) was accepted on March 7, every paper in the United Kingdom published either the day after or a day or two afterwards not only the fact of the Contract, but most of the terms of it." If this is intended to suggest that the Government issued a statement, Sir Edward Carson was misinstructed in spite of this amazing statement in the evidence of the Postmaster-General:

Mr. F. E. Smith: You have told me that that tender was sent in by the company on February 13, 1912. When was that tender answered? *A.* (*Mr. Samuel*). There were negotiations proceeding on certain points, and various modifications were arranged in the clauses of the tender, and it was accepted on March 7 by a letter which was sent by the Secretary to the Post Office, with the approval of myself and also with the approval of the Treasury, to the company, showing that they accepted this tender.

Q. When the letter of March 7, of which you have spoken, was sent, was the matter made public or not? *A.* Yes, it was at once made public in the Press.

Q. It was published in every paper? *A.* Yes, it was well known.

Q. The letter saying that the tender had been accepted subject to certain specified modifications? *A.* Yes.

This blunder was immediately rectified by the witness who once again explains and defends his prolonged secretiveness between March and July:

Q. You have told me that the Contract was signed on July 19, 1912, and I will ask you a general question on this: Was the course that was pursued in every respect consistent with the whole trend of Parliamentary precedent construed most strictly? *A.* (*Mr. Herbert Samuel*). Precisely, it was absolutely in accordance with all previous precedents relating to Post Office contracts. Indeed, it would have been contrary to all precedent, and I am not at all sure that it would have been in order to have presented the tender, and the letter accepting the tender, to Parliament in lieu of the Contract itself.

As is well known, despite conflicting Ministerial statements the initiative remained with the Marconi Company who gave their version of their triumph in a circular to their shareholders, while for weeks and months *pace* Sir Edward Carson, the Post Office, fenced with enquiries from both sides of the House of Commons. This regrettable reticence of the British Government was of the utmost value to the company, as it enabled them to put what construction they pleased on the agreement of March 7, and it materially promoted their American enterprise, which merits as close scrutiny as their clever capture of the Post Office which had assented to what a leading Radical critic and expert described as "something approaching a monopoly." This is no overstatement. Indeed, should Parliament be so unwise as to ratify the Marconi Contract, and should the Dominions be so feeble and foolish as to follow suit, the British Empire would find itself at the mercy of a cosmopolitan Wireless Trust, comparatively useless in peace and potentially dangerous in war.

The moment our Post Office capitulated on March 7, the centre of interest shifts across the Atlantic. Mr. Marconi (the chairman),

Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the general manager, and a posse comitatus of assistants took the first steamer to New York, where a banquet was given on Saturday, March 16, in honour of Mr. Marconi, by the *New York Times*, in the Tower Hall of the *Times* building. A complete list of the guests would be interesting and probably instructive. In describing this function, the *New York Times* stated that for three months "practically all of its daily foreign service" had come by wireless telegraphy. "Until last night (*i.e.* the Marconi banquet) best record made in the transmission of despatches from London to the *Times* was fifty-five minutes . . . the British lines, which are under the management of the British P.O., have usually consumed an hour or more in sending messages from London to Clifden." But on this happy occasion the British lines appear to have been cleared in order to show what the Marconi Company could do, and two British messages from London to the *New York Times* were actually transmitted in the astonishing time of ten minutes. The famous telegram from "Sir Rufus Isaacs, Attorney-General of Great Britain," as he is described, only took fourteen minutes. As it has occasionally been misprinted, *e.g.* in the *National Review* of last month and in my evidence before the Marconi Committee—as the *Financial News* has pointed out—I reproduce this fateful message as it appeared in the *New York Times* to which it was sent.

London, Sunday, March 17th.

Please congratulate Marconi and my brother (Godfrey Isaacs, General Manager of the Marconi Company) on the successful development of a marvellous enterprise. I wish them all success in New York and hope that by the time they * come back the coal strike will be finished.

Sgd. Rufus Isaacs.

The Attorney-General dismissed this message as "a very trumpery affair" during the House of Commons debate of October 11, but it may be doubted whether he would do so to-day. For one thing his memory was clearly astray, because he suggested in that speech that the boom in British Marconi shares was already over when he sent it, though, as a matter of fact, they went up £1 during the week after his telegram, and £5 in the following month. In his evidence in the *Matin* case, as our readers can see

* This word was misprinted "you" in my evidence and in the last number of the *National Review*.

by turning back a few pages, he laid special stress on the fact that on April 17 (exactly a month after his congratulatory telegram) "they (British Marconi shares) had reached $9\frac{3}{4}$, which is the highest price that they ever did touch. They had gone up from something like £4 10*s*. a share, I think, on March 7 or March 8, at which they were, and then for various reasons which I cannot of course go into, they had gone to the price of $9\frac{11}{16}$ and $9\frac{3}{4}$, which was the highest price they had ever touched, and they had reached that by April 17." *

Clever men occasionally fail to recognise the inevitable effect of their own actions. Otherwise Sir Rufus Isaacs would readily acknowledge that this telegram was at best "a blazing indiscretion." Coming from the Attorney-General—whom an ignorant public would naturally imagine to have had an active hand as principal Law Officer in shaping the Marconi agreement—it emphasised the connection between the British Government and the Marconi Company, which the latter did not hesitate to describe as a "partnership."

As a member of the British Government, Sir Rufus Isaacs seemed to be congratulating the Marconi directors on their brilliant arrangement with its ten per cent. royalty on gross receipts, while in wishing Mr. Marconi and his brother "all success in New York," the unsophisticated, who always outnumber the sophisticated, might easily imagine that he was referring to the business aspects of a visit of which the object was to litigate with the United Wireless Company, which forthwith collapsed, and in its place arose a renewed American Marconi Company, which is now the centre of universal interest.

It cannot be doubted that Sir Rufus Isaacs' message was of enormous value to the Marconi Company in the United States, though I am not for a moment suggesting that he appreciated the full consequences of his folly in sending it.

Curiously enough, in trying to show that other things than the

* Compare this statement in Court with Sir Rufus Isaacs' suggestion in the House of Commons (October 11):

"I am reminded the telegram to which reference has been made (*i.e.* the Marconi banquet telegram) was sent after 7th March. The announcement had been made already in the public Press, and the shares had already been going up, so that it had nothing to do with that. *It had all passed.*" (My italics.)

Post Office Agreement had inflated Marconi shares, Mr. Herbert Samuel told the House of Commons (October 11) that, as a result of successful actions in America "on March 25 (1912) they (*i.e.* the British Marconi Company) absorbed the important United Wireless Company of the United States. The *Times*, in their financial article of March 27 last (1912), said that "there was strong buying of Marconi ordinary shares on the news of the absorption, and they pointed out the rise in price."

The Postmaster-General's observation must astonish the *Westminster Gazette*—if our contemporary is capable of astonishment—as it negatives the convenient theory that the British and the American Marconi Companies have no connection beyond the distinguished name which has been so unhappily exploited by greedy speculators.

The reader will understand that these pages are written between the action against *Le Matin* and any discussion that may take place in Parliament on the initiative of the Leader of the Opposition, who instantly grasped the gravity of the issue, and invited the Prime Minister to make a statement before the Easter adjournment. On Mr. Asquith's refusal, Mr. Bonar Law announced that he should afford Mr. Asquith an opportunity of reconsidering his silence after Easter. I am also writing before any action taken by the Marconi Committee, whose proceedings remain shrouded in impenetrable mystery. There are "rumours" that they propose at last to hear Ministers, as they have been urged to do, in season and out of season, by the *National Review* and by its Editor in his evidence. But one is solemnly warned against believing any "rumour" unless supported by several sworn affidavits, and no such evidence is available. The powers-that-be, whoever they may be, probably realise in spite of the "Hush-Ups" that the public will no longer be satisfied by the evidence of a few selected Ministers after the sorry trick played last October upon the House of Commons and the country—with the connivance of the Prime Minister, if we may believe *Reynolds' Newspaper*, of which the Managing Director was recently made a Privy Councillor by Mr. Asquith. Every member of the Cabinet, headed by the Prime Minister himself, must appear before the Committee and after that the full tally of minor Ministers.

No apology is needed for reproducing a portion of the précis

of evidence which I prepared at the request of the Marconi Select Committee at the end of last year, and submitted to the Committee on or about January 1, as it has gathered tenfold force from subsequent developments. Some alterations were made during the long interval before I was called as a witness, and I quote textually from the evidence as published in the Special Report:

The public are undoubtedly uneasy about this business, because the rumours about particular Ministers—not the Postmaster-General—are circumstantial and persistent, and it may be hoped that whatever else it may do, the present Committee may be able to vindicate the fame of one and all of his Majesty's Ministers. I confess to sharing the general uneasiness as matters stand at present. Over four months * have elapsed since the discussion in the House of Commons, but Ministers have done nothing whatsoever to dispel the mist of suspicion overhanging the affair. Mr. Samuel stated that Ministers "will be most ready to appear before"—I am quoting him—the Committee. One might have conceived that they would have appeared at its first sitting, clamouring to state in the most categorical and emphatic manner that neither directly nor indirectly, in their own names, or in other people's names, have they had any transactions whatsoever, either in London, Dublin, New York, Brussels, Amsterdam, Paris, or any other financial centre, in *any* shares in *any* Marconi Company throughout the negotiations of the Government, and that neither they nor any of their belongings have participated in the profitable rings, pools, and syndicates for dealing in options of which there are believed to have been an unusual number in this business. Doubtless they will be willing to produce the pass-books of all their accounts at every bank at which they bank, fortified by the evidence of the bank managers, in order to clear the matter up, so far as such evidence is conclusive. The public is equally entitled to know that Ministers privy to the negotiations, did not take advantage of such knowledge to put their friends on to "a good thing" at the expense of less privileged individuals as this would have been a decidedly undemocratic proceeding.

Now take Sir Rufus Isaacs' evidence before Mr. Justice Darling, where he had the supreme advantage of Sir Edward Carson's assistance, and the yet greater advantage of escaping cross-examination. Scrutinise every syllable with meticulous care, because the Attorney-General is a master of subtle accuracy which conveys one meaning to ignorant excited political partisans and emotional journalists, and another to legal experts, or to those who have made it their business to study this fascinating mystery. The Attorney-General's disclaimer in the House of Commons on October 11 was skilfully constructed, and encouraged the belief that neither he nor any other Minister, so far as he knew,

* In the original précis the words were presumably "nearly three months." If giving evidence at the moment of writing one would be obliged to say "Over five and a half months."

had speculated in any Marconi shares during the negotiations which Mr. Samuel always insisted lasted until July:

I do really think it would be a very great descent from the standard we have set up in public life if, by reason of the fact that there is some opposition to me, or by reason of the fact that my brother happens to be the Managing Director of the Company, which he was before I ever came into office at all, and has been in negotiation with one of my colleagues in the Cabinet, assisted, as my right hon. friend was, by various committees, the suggestion should be made—I am waiting at the present moment to know upon what it is—that I had taken advantage, or that my colleagues had taken advantage, of the information which we had that these negotiations were proceeding and of our expectation that the contract would be completed to indulge in great speculations in shares, in order that we might take advantage of the public announcement and reap a profit. As I have said, there is not one single vestige of foundation for any one of those statements.

From that day to this the entire Coalition Press has attributed all the "rumours" of Ministerial dealings in Marconi shares to malignant or diseased imagination. And yet those were right who distrusted this statement at the time, and refused to be silenced by the Attorney-General's other equally categorical disclaimer which sounded so convincing, but was studded with loopholes. I quote the official Report:

Let me go to the next charge, which is, I think, a worse charge. It is that some member of the Government not named, but hinted at—some member or members of the Cabinet—knowing that these negotiations were taking place, knowing that there was a contract in contemplation, and thinking the shares would go up when the announcement of the contract came to be made—the price of the shares being then 14*s.* or 15*s.* and eventually rose to £9 after the announcement of the contract was made—thereupon, and in consequence of the information which some member of the Government had got, bought shares in this company at a low price, in order to sell them at the higher price when the contract was announced. I desire to say frankly, on behalf of myself, that that is absolutely untrue. Never from the beginning, when the shares were 14*s.* or £9, have I had one single transaction with the shares of that company. I am not only speaking for myself, but I am also speaking on behalf, I know, of both my right hon. friend the Postmaster-General, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, in some way or other, in some of the articles, have been brought into this matter.

My suspicions were aroused by this statement, full as it undoubtedly was of subtle accuracy, though, if the Postmaster-General's view of "the Contract" be correct, it was dangerously misleading, as the *Nation*, which is politically at the antipodes to the *National Review*, has handsomely and honourably acknowledged—thus offering a characteristic contrast to the tortuous *Westminster Gazette*, the infuriate *Daily News*, or the frantic

Manchester *Guardian*, &c., which are all endeavouring to fight a rearguard action with the only weapon they can handle—the gutter squirt. Says the *Nation* (March 22, 1913):

> In commenting on these disclosures (in *Le Matin* case), we feel bound to say that, in common with the rest of the public, we were under the impression that the charges or suggestions of Ministerial dealings in any shares associated with the various Marconi Companies had been disposed of by Sir Rufus Isaacs' statement in the House of Commons on October 11. It appears that we were wrong and Mr. Maxse was right in concluding that the Attorney-General's denial had reference simply to dealings in these shares of the parent company (with which the Government's contract was made) under circumstances implying corruption. . . . Sir Rufus Isaacs confined himself to repelling this capital accusation. But we are bound to offer the comment that the public gave his denial a wider range, and understood it to falsify the mass of gossip which attributed *any* participation by *any* Ministers in *any* Marconi undertaking. The purchase of shares in the American Company having been made a month after the signature of the contract, &c.*

In order to appreciate the *Matin* case, we need only imagine the effect on the House of Commons last October supposing Sir Rufus Isaacs had concluded his speech somewhat as follows: "Mr. Speaker: I feel that having regard to the position I occupy as his Majesty's Attorney-General, specially promoted to the Cabinet, who holds the House in high regard and is grateful for the treatment he has always received from all parties, I cannot sit down without referring to one transaction in which I became involved on the advice of my brother—the Managing Director of the Marconi Company. As I have said, never at any time did I or the Chancellor of the Exchequer touch a share in the parent company—the Marconi Company—with which the Postmaster-General has been negotiating, but I saw no harm in taking 10,000 shares in one of its associate companies—the American Marconi Company. As I want to be candid with the House, I should point out that three of the members of the parent Marconi Board, including my brother, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, and Mr. Marconi himself, also have seats on the Board of the American Company in which the parent holds a controlling block of shares and of which it to that extent directs the policy. I bought my shares on very favourable terms on April 17, two days before the regular market opened, and six weeks after the Marconi Company

* Our contemporary will, we feel, surely not overlook the fact that Mr. Herbert Samuel has from first to last emphasised the fact that the Contract was not completed until July.

announced that the Contract with the Government had been got, but three months before the House of Commons was fully informed, as the Postmaster-General tells me there were still outstanding difficulties before the Contract could be completed. You will understand that the American Company had nothing to do with these negotiations, though members of their Board were conducting them, and in any case my advice was never asked. I was merely making what I regarded as a profitable investment. I might have got these 10,000 shares for about £15,000, and within forty-eight hours they were worth £40,000. In order to enable two personal friends to share in the good fortune, I sold 1000 shares to the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd George) and another 1000 to the then Chief Whip, the Master of Elibank, at the price I gave for them. Unfortunately, although our joint holding in the American Marconi Company was, as I have said, at one time approximately £40,000, none of us took our profit and we all expect to be substantially out of pocket on the transaction."

There have been many political sensations in our time, but none to eclipse such a statement as that which the Attorney-General might, with perfect propriety, have made in the House of Commons on October 11, 1912, as an addendum to what he did say.

The reader, momentarily misled by the "Hush-Up" Press, may challenge the fairness of putting such a statement on the Attorney-General. All I have done is to read his evidence before Mr. Justice Darling in the light of facts available to every one at pains to seek them and to put it in the form of a speech. Impending developments will show whether this is a fair speech, as also whether the title of this article is justified.

L. J. Maxse.

March 24, 1913

THE HEDGEHOG

The hedgehog is an interesting little creature, for, though of a quiet and retiring nature, it has many peculiar ways and habits, while among the country folk it is the hero of some strange tales. Its appearance alone is so different from that of all our other English mammals that it at once calls forth remark: we have no other animal clad in a spiny armour, which rolls itself up into a ball on the approach of danger without making the least attempt to get away; but when one gets a good look at a hedgehog, it is obvious that flight for such a short-legged creature is quite out of the question, for the slowest of enemies would have no difficulty in overtaking it. The only thing it can do is to curl itself up with its nose tucked between its hind legs, erect its "prickles," and hope for the best, for it has no other means of defence; it cannot even bite! At least not to damage a foe. In this attitude the little animal has all its vulnerable parts protected, and the exceedingly stiff, spiny coat of its upper parts makes a very disagreeable thing for any dog, fox, or badger to attempt to bite, and generally it is left in peace, perhaps a cub occasionally samples one, but it may be taken for granted that it does not try twice. When not alarmed the hedgehog is a very different creature from the prickly ball that we all know so well. It is a smooth-coated animal then, the spines looking almost like hair as they lie evenly and closely to its body, while its hairy grey face, sharp eyes, piglike snout, sensitive nose, and look of alertness, give an idea of intelligence one would never have expected. Its movements, too, are more nimble than its very short legs would warrant one to expect; it can climb quite steep banks in a surprising manner, and jog along on uneven ground at a fairly good pace, though not fast enough to get away from any of the flesh-eating animals, nor to catch even the youngest of birds or

rabbits, assuming for the sake of argument that it had the wish to do so!

In the long distant ages, when creatures were not like they are now, we can imagine the hedgehog as a hairy, defenceless little animal, leading a harmless, inoffensive existence, destroying the prehistoric insects, and eating the prehistoric carrion, but much persecuted by the flesh-eating beasts of the time, perhaps almost to the point of extermination, until there one day arose a hedgehog with a coarse bristly coat that was not very nice as a mouthful for its foes. It would certainly have a better chance of surviving, or at least living longer than its smooth-coated relatives, and so leaving more descendants. Among these there would almost sure to be some that had even more prickly hair than their ancestors, and though it might not avail them with a very hungry animal that was in a hurry for a meal, yet if it was any advantage at all we may be certain it would be preserved and improved in each generation, so that the prickly spines would be evolved at last. Another step forward on the line of "passive resistance" would take place when a hedgehog occurred which erected its spines and tucked its head out of the way, the tighter it rolled itself up the more difficult it would be for its foe to deal with, and so the modern hedgehog would be the result, a placid animal that goes quietly on its way, never hurrying, but taking what fate may send it, rolling into a prickly ball at the slightest alarm, and quietly uncurling and going on about its business as soon as the danger is past.

In these islands the hedgehog has not many foes at the present time, though what it had in bygone ages is another matter, for we know that the fauna of Great Britain has changed considerably within comparatively recent periods; even historic times have seen the wolf exterminated and the wild cat, polecat, and marten become so rare as to be practically gone, while the same period has seen rats established in the country and a new bird in the woods, to say nothing of numerous other instances, while the recent geological periods show still greater differences; but it is of the present day we are speaking, of the foes that the hedgehog has to fear now. There are but two, the fox and the badger, and I should very much doubt the former often managing such a difficult task, but the badger is said to accomplish the deed sometimes; however, I have

never found any evidence of the fact, but as the badger is capable of robbing wasps' nests and often does so, it may not mind "Mr. Prickles"!

Apart from its natural enemies the hedgehog has one great foe that probably accounts for a good proportion of those which die violent deaths, this is the countryman, and that variety of him known as the gamekeeper! Of course many of the younger men know the true habits and ways of the "urchin"—as it is called in many districts—but the older ones are hard to convince. Tradition dies with difficulty, and it says that the hedgehog is an enemy of game; so it *must* be true, they argue, and so the poor little animal is condemned afresh.

The charges against it are those of eating the eggs of partridges and pheasants, killing the young birds, and devouring young rabbits; the two latter charges being often accompanied by what at first appears to be strong circumstantial evidence, namely that the animal was found eating the victim, or that it was found with part of the body in a hole. But it should be remembered that eating does not necessarily mean having done the killing! As a matter of fact the hedgehog is very fond of carrion, and will eat anything it finds lying about, no matter how "high" the carcass may be, and those I have had in captivity eat all sorts and condition of meat greedily, dead rats, cooked stuff from the kitchen, rabbit flesh, &c., munching it all up in a most businesslike way, with their sharp little teeth specially formed for such work. But to kill animals for themselves is quite another matter; when one seriously considers it the idea of the short-legged "hedgepig" pursuing and killing an active rabbit seems too absurd! Though it and similar wild statements do gain ground, but the way they arise is not very difficult to imagine. For instance, suppose it is a fine summer evening, when the fast failing light shows the meadows dotted with hay-cocks, or clear and green where they have all been carried, then, as the "edge of night" arrives, and silence sinks upon the land, the creatures of the dark begin to wake up and make their presence felt and heard, for if the night is silent it is only by comparison with the noisy day; really it has many, many sounds of its own. There is the high-pitched squeaking of the bats, the hooting of the owls, the bark of a fox, and the scufflings of tiny creatures in every brake and brier-bush. Then

from a disused rabbit-hole steals forth another of the timid animals that hunt by night, it is our friend the hedgehog, who quits his snug bed of dry leaves, grass, and moss, to see what he can find among the dew-sodden grass. He raises his little damp pig-like nose (which, no doubt, gained him his name) to sniff the cool air and glean the news of all the creatures that are abroad, then lowers it, and jogs off, for he cannot smell anything that interests him. He hunts here, he hunts there, he pushes his sensitive snout in between the grass stems, and many a worm and beetle fall victims, but his appetite is not nearly satisfied when a whiff of something quite different reaches him. It is the scent of putrid meat, but to a hedgehog nothing could be more delightful, and he follows it up until he finds a dead rabbit lying out in the field. It has been killed some days, as its very powerful odour testifies, its eyes are gone, picked out by a magpie probably, and the orange and black burying-beetles are already on the scene. The way the poor creature met its fate is obvious enough, for there is a hole bitten in the back of its neck: the stoat, and the stoat alone, is responsible.

However, the hedgehog does not care, he has a good meal in front of him, and that is all that matters; in his anxiety to get to work he does not even bother to erect his spines when he feels a tremor of the ground which was caused by a rabbit thumping its heels on the soil as a signal to its friends and relatives that there was danger about. The "urchin" has commenced to eat, pushing his little black nose into the hole that the stoat made, and chewing steadily away. Again is heard the rabbit signal, and under ordinary circumstances the hedgehog would have curled up at once, for there is nothing he is so sensitive to as vibrations of the ground, but this time he goes on eating, until other and more unmistakable shakings at last alarm him. These thumps come at regular intervals, and in another minute a man walks on to the scene. It is the keeper, who seeing something dark on the ground, stops, lights a match, and finds a hedgehog lying tightly curled up on the top of a dead rabbit. He probably exclaims, "Here's another of those dratted 'urchins'!" And knocks it on the head—or some other vital part, the head not being visible—with his stick. Next morning the hedgehog will appear on the gibbet in the wood, where he will hang, together with others of

his kind, and creatures also called "vermin," until such time as wind, weather, and decay shall allow his bones to seek the kindly earth beneath, where moss and leaves will cover them over.

In the meantime the keeper will tell his cronies, "That 'urchins' be awful vermin," and that the night he was coming "back from helpin' 'em with the hay at Old Jones's"—when perhaps his sense of smell was a little dulled by the excellent cider which had been served out to the helpers!—"I come across one of 'em eating a rabbit it had killed out in the middle of the big meadow."

I feel sure the hedgehog has often been condemned on slighter evidence than the above, such as getting caught in a trap baited with meat, but intended for some other creature; but at any rate the fact remains, it has a very bad character, out of all proportion to its size or strength, with the result that the poor animal gets little mercy if it is caught taking its walks abroad; so that it is one of the commonest of creatures to meet with on gibbets of those keepers who have no descrimination.

The old proverb says there is "no smoke without a fire," and I do not assert that some of the charges are altogether groundless, only that they are very much exaggerated. As I have already pointed out the hedgehog has such similar tastes to its namesake the pig, that it is not at all particular what it devours, and if fortune places eggs in its way I have no doubt it does not say "No, thank you," but takes with gratitude what fortune sends. Likewise with very young and helpless rabbits, which if left exposed it might not be averse to; but then as a rule the parent leaves her babies most carefully sealed up, the earth over the hole being padded and stamped down in a way that makes it seem strange the young things are not smothered. Nor should the deeds of an eccentric individual be visited on the species as a whole, with every sort of an animal examples occur that depart from the type in their habits and conduct. Yet, granting every possible evil inclination to the poor little hedgehog, that it should, single-handed, kill fowls does not seem credible, yet it has been asserted—and not by any ignorant labourer—that it will do this, the statement being even published in a leading paper devoted to country affairs—undoubtedly closer investigation would have revealed another explanation. The natural food of the "urchin"

being grubs of all sorts, worms, beetles, and such small things, which it spends the nights hunting industriously for, it really does great good, and deserves every protection. It also has the credit —from some writers—of destroying frogs, snakes, and blindworms, and it will certainly eat dead ones greedily, but considerable adroitness is wanted to catch a frog, and I think further evidence is wanted on the point. Such a good observer as Gilbert White remarks that it feeds nearly entirely on beetles (though he makes a mistake when attributing the eating of plantain roots to it), but has no reference to any such thing as frog or snake killing. The fact that beetles form a great part of its food can be easily confirmed by an examination of its excrement, which will be found to be composed almost entirely of their hard and indigestible portions, such as the elytra.

Gilbert White's description of young hedgehogs is wonderfully accurate. "Thier spines are quite white at this age," he says; "and they have little hanging ears, which I do not remember to be discernible in the old ones. They can, in part, at this age draw their skin down over their faces; but are not able to contract themselves into a ball, as they do, for the sake of defence, when they are full-grown."

Some little hedgehogs I had exactly answered to this description. They were born in captivity, but in a few days their spines (which are quite soft to begin with) had begun to harden and grow darker. Unfortunately I was not able to watch them grow up, as they died at the end of the week. Probably I did not provide the mother with something she required, though I got her everything it was possible to think an "urchin" might like or want.

Older families have done well in captivity. Four young "hogs" were caught one year in a meadow near our house and brought to me. I thought they would make good photographs, so shut them up until next day. In the morning two full-grown "urchins" were brought me that had also been caught the previous evening, but at a spot some half a mile or more from the place where the babies had been picked up—by the by, the latter were not really very small and were quite able to earn their own living. I was rather at a loss what to do with the last two arrivals, but finally put them into the rabbit-hutch in which the young

ones had been placed, thinking I could take a photograph next day and then give them all their liberty. In the evening I went to the hutch to feed them, and opened it very quietly so as not to alarm the "happy family." To my astonishment I saw it was indeed a happy family, for the smaller of the two old hedgehogs was stretched out on her side, and the four young ones were lying in a row sucking away like little pigs with an old sow. They were having such a hearty meal that I drew back without disturbing them. I fancy the explanation must have been that the old hedgehog had a family somewhere, and being without them, adopted the others in their place. At any rate I returned them as soon as I could to the hedgerow where the old ones had come from, and have often wondered what happened to them all.

Another family I had consisted of a mother and two young ones, the latter being about a fourth of the size of their parent, and really very sweet little creatures. They were quite old enough to be able to curl up if they wanted to, but they were young enough not to have learnt fear, and while their mother would roll up on the very slightest provocation, they never attempted it. After the first day, indeed, I often wished they would curl, for while endeavouring to take a photograph of them it was more than tiresome when they would run off in different directions, while their parent remained tightly rolled up, and only poked her nose out at those seconds when I was fetching her children home. But at last I got everything right, and the old one appeared about to look up; I inserted a plate in the camera, but as I did so she suddenly toddled off, straight for a pond that was close at hand and took to the water before I could stop her, and swam boldly for the opposite side.

Hedgehogs are, in fact, remarkably good swimmers, though certainly one would not guess it from their appearance, but many a mischievous boy knows of the fact, as nothing makes an "urchin" uncurl like dropping it into water; what blows and force could not do water will effect instantly.

An intimate acquaintance with a "Prickles" reveals it to be quite a charming creature; but one wants to have so thoroughly won its confidence that it will not dream of rolling up when touched, as there is nothing pleasant about a ball of spines, the pricks from which smart in a most uncomfortable way. To get

one really tame it must be obtained young, so that like my little ones it shall not know there is such a thing as fear. These babies were such funny wee things, with small grey faces, and little black feet, in short, perfect reproductions of their parents in all respects save size. There was only one thing about them that was not nice, but in which they were not peculiar, as it is common to all members of the species, and to other kinds of creatures as well, namely, their large and numerous fleas! The "urchin" can compete with either the mole or the shrew-mouse in this matter, though they are both animals with very large and fine ones. For this reason I give the warning, do not try to pick up or carry any hedgehog you chance to meet with unless you are prepared to take all risks. I shall never forget a hedgehog which was seen on the lawn when we were at dinner and which I rushed out to and picked up in my napkin—I dropped that napkin very hastily when I looked at it as the "urchin" was placed on the ground.

Hedgehog families are never very large, from two to four being the average, but sometimes there are five or even six. They are born in the early summer, and are usually old enough to go on expeditions with their mother by the time the hay is out. Occasionally the old one has a second litter in the autumn, indeed some authorities say it is the usual thing for them to do so, but in this part of the country (Shropshire) it is certainly the exception and not the rule.

The "nest" is usually made in some safe snug place such as a disused rabbit-hole, where the mother collects a quantity of grass, moss, and leaves, from the surrounding bushes, until she has a warm bed. It is a curious sight to see her gathering this stuff, and one not often to be obtained. She makes short excursions into the grass and under the bushes, returning each time with a mouthful of dry stuff or even green grass, which is laid down at the entrance to the hole while she goes back to fetch yet more. At last, when there is a biggish heap, she begins to carry it below.

How long the young ones remain with their parent is a difficult matter to say, but by the time the autumn has come the family party has broken up, for one seldom or never finds more than one "pig" in the same winter quarters. The winter nest is very carefully made, for, being an insect-eating animal, the

hedgehog passes the greater part of the cold weather in a state of profound unconsciousness, but the hibernation may at any time be broken by a spell of warm weather, when it will come out for a stroll to see if there is any stray beetle about, and to get a drink from the nearest puddle or stream. Like most animals it cannot go long without water, and those kept in captivity should always have a supply at hand.

The very fact that it hibernates proves that insects are the main factor in the diet of this animal, for not being able to store up such fragile food—unless it is in the form of fat in the tissues of its body!—it has to sleep away the months when they are scarce, or die of starvation! So it retires into the innermost recesses of an old rabbit-hole, or under an ancient tree-stump, and dreams away the cold periods when the chill wind comes whistling down the narrow passage and the snowflakes lie piled at the door, in the warm snug nest where neither can reach it, only waking to real activity with the warm spring rains and breezes that make the hedgerows burst into greenery and bring to life all the world of insects. Then it issues forth to enjoy life once more, and munch up the worms and beetles.

FRANCES PITT.

AMERICAN AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON, *March* 7, 1913.

FOR the second time only in nearly a quarter of a century the Democrats are returned to power. Three days ago Mr. Taft became a private citizen, and the long chapter of Republican supremacy closed. The United States, most Americans believe, is about to enter upon a new era in politics.

Mr. Wilson comes to the Presidency to face tremendous difficulties. His election was made possible by a combination of antagonistic forces, which is as incongruous as mixing fire and water without harm to either. He was elected because he satisfied the Radical wing of his own Party, and was to the Conservatives less Radical than one of his opponents. He satisfied the Democrats, he did not satisfy the Republicans of Conservative tendencies, but to them he was less to be feared than Mr. Roosevelt, and they voted for him rather than for Mr. Roosevelt. Had the Republicans who voted for Mr. Wilson given their support to Mr. Roosevelt, the latter, would in all probability have been elected.

If the American President was by the Constitution or the law limited to a single term his task would be easier. It is the desire to be re-elected that pulls him in different directions no matter how loyal he may be to his convictions, or how determined to remain faithful to his ideals. It seems absurd that, no sooner has the President taken his seat, than the thought of his re-election should be uppermost; but to that end every politician looks forward, and everything that the President does will be considered in its effect upon his re-election. Every President naturally desires a re-election, it is a perfectly proper ambition, and even the strongest man must be to a degree influenced by that desire. To be re-elected, Mr. Wilson must satisfy both

elements that made his election possible—the Radicals as well as the Conservatives—a task so difficult that one would say it was almost hopeless. That was one of the mistakes Mr. Taft made, and it was one of the causes that brought about his defeat. He went into office as representative of the Conservative element of the country as distinguished from the Radicalism of Mr. Roosevelt; but while Conservative in the sense of respecting established institutions, and especially the Constitution, and feeling that he was bound by its limitations, he was not wedded to the past or opposed to Progress simply because something new was offered. His mistake, however, was in believing that it was possible to retain the support of the Conservatives and not to alienate the Radicals, and it was an attempt to combine incompatible elements. When the chemist does that an explosion usually follows, and he has to pay the penalty for his rashness or ignorance. Mr. Taft went experimenting in the political laboratory and suffered for his temerity.

Based on Mr. Wilson's character, his writings and his speeches, and the men whom he has gathered about him as the members of his Cabinet, the prediction can be made with safety that his Administration will be Radical as the word is used in the United States, and that it is to the Radicals, the Progressives as they are usually called, and not the Conservatives, that he will appeal to sustain his policies and on whose approval he will rely for re-election. In that he is in harmony with the majority of his countrymen. The country at the present time is Radical. How soon it may cease to be Radical and turn back to a more moderate course, in thought as well as action, no one would care to say, because there is nothing upon which to base prophecy. The majority is always fickle, here as well as elsewhere. At times it swings from one political pole to the other with startling rapidity and little warning. Two years hence, which will be the first opportunity afforded to test public sentiment, Mr. Wilson may be a great deal stronger than he is to-day, or so much weaker that the Congressional election may make clear the verdict the people will pronounce when Mr. Wilson again offers himself as a candidate. If Radicalism has not waned, Mr. Wilson need have no fears, and the rivalry of Mr. Roosevelt will not cause him undue apprehension, for the country is not large enough to support

two Radical candidates, and the President fights from a vantage-ground from which he cannot easily be dislodged; but if, on the other hand, the wave of reform has spent itself, and the people are weary of reforms that accomplish no reform, the opportunity for the return of Mr. Taft or a man of his school will be excellent.

•

The people expect much of Mr. Wilson. He knows that. Recently he said that a working woman who found it desperately hard to keep body and soul together hoped for his election because his success would make bread cheaper. Mr. Wilson referred to that as showing the expectations that were raised, and the impossibility of his satisfying them no matter how earnestly he might work to meet the public demand. No President can make bread cheaper, and that is what the American people want. If bread is not made cheaper they want more money to buy the bread which they must have; if they are able to buy bread they want meat; if they have meat they want something else. They are not starving; far from it, they are able to buy more bread and more meat and more other things than the great mass in any other country, but they are ignorant of that, or if aware of it they see no reason for contentment. There is no scarcity of work, but there is a scarcity of labour, and the result is high wages and steady employment; but despite high wages paid in certain trades there is a great deal of underpaid labour, the sweat shop exists in America as it does elsewhere (to the shame of civilisation), women have to work long hours for a miserable wage, the middle class, here as in Europe, has longings for and an appreciation of the refinement and luxuries of life and is unable to satisfy them. That these things are true every one knows, that they can be remedied may well be doubted; but that would involve a discussion that is neither pertinent at this time nor to be lightly begun. I am simply stating facts, and the facts are patent. In other countries, among older civilisations, the efforts to correct inequalities and to ameliorate conditions are never ceasing, but longer experience makes the statesman suspicious of the short cut to perfection. Here it is the remedy most in favour. Temperamentally the American people are a people always in a hurry and intolerant of caution. They have been able to make so many mistakes

with impunity because they have been so blessed by nature and a wonderful combination of circumstances, that they feel they can take risks, and what would have ruined other people has left them unscarred. The American people have almost the same superstitious belief in the power of the President to remedy evils that mediæval England had in the power of the king to cure bodily ills by the laying on of hands. The woman working long hours for starvation wages cherishes the delusion that the President can make bread cheaper, but President Wilson entertains no illusions.

Of the ten members of Mr. Wilson's Cabinet, seven of them can fairly be called Radicals. Incidentally it may be remarked, that since living in the United States I have seen the Cabinet grow from seven to ten members. The first Cabinet consisted of only five members, the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, the Attorney-General, and the Postmaster-General. Twelve years later the office of Secretary of the Navy was created and the Cabinet as then constituted remained unchanged until 1849, when the Interior Department was established with a Secretary at its head who became, *ex officio*, a member of the Cabinet. Under Mr. Cleveland's administration, in 1889, the Agricultural Bureau had assumed such importance that it was raised to the dignity of a Department in charge of a Secretary instead of a Commissioner; and in 1903, Congress created the Department of Commerce and Labour. Two days before Mr. Taft's term expired, Congress passed an Act separating the labour functions of the Department and creating a separate Department of Labour, and as Mr. Roosevelt appointed the first Secretary of Commerce and Labour, so it fell to Mr. Wilson to appoint the first Secretary of Labour. The American Cabinet, it may be added, unlike the British Cabinet, is not a flexible body although similar to it in being an extra legal creation. Neither the American Constitution nor any statute recognises the Cabinet as such; the "Executive Departments" have a legal existence and their heads constitute the Cabinet. It would be perfectly proper and within the power of the President to invite anyone to be present at a meeting of the Cabinet or to take part in its deliberations, but that is never done. Mr. Wilson said before

his inauguration that he might ask the Vice-President—whose only duties are to act as presiding officer of the Senate, but who takes no part in debate and may not vote unless to break a tie—to sit with the Cabinet, a suggestion that created a good deal of comment, because the Vice-President has seldom been on terms of close intimacy with his chief; but at the first meeting of the Cabinet under the new régime Mr. Marshall was not present, and it is not likely that the more than century-old tradition will be broken.

In nearly every Cabinet there is a surprise; almost always one man, sometimes two and not infrequently three, of whom the country at large has never heard are given a national reputation by being made members of the Cabinet. President Wilson has not violated precedent. His Secretary of War, Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, of New Jersey, has never taken part in politics and outside of New Jersey is known only to lawyers, where he was one of the leaders of the bar, and at the time of his appointment was Vice-Chancellor of the State, one of its highest judicial officers. Likewise, Mr. David Franklin Houston, the Secretary of Agriculture, is a tyro in politics. All his life has been spent as an educator, and he went from the Chancellorship of Washington University in St. Louis to take his seat at the Cabinet table. Of the other eight members of the Cabinet four have served in Congress—Mr. Bryan, Secretary of State; Mr. Burleson, the Postmaster-General; Mr. Redfield, the Secretary of Commerce, and Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of Labour. Of the remaining four two have long been active in politics. Mr. Daniels, the Secretary of the Navy, was Chief Clerk of the Interior Department by appointment of President Cleveland, and for a great many years has been prominent in Party affairs; Mr. Lane, the Secretary of Interior, was the Democratic candidate for Governor of California in 1902, but was defeated, and was the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission when President Wilson invited him to join the Cabinet. Mr. McAdoo, the Secretary of the Treasury, is known to all the country and to a great many engineers and other persons throughout the world, as the promoter and builder of the Hudson River tunnels in New York, one of the great engineering enterprises of our day. Mr. McAdoo is not an engineer, he is a lawyer by profession, but he saw the necessity

of increasing the transportation facilities of New York by substituting tunnels for the antiquated ferries, then the only bridge to Manhattan Island, and in the face of the tremendous obstacles carried the project through. His energy, courage and practical knowledge of business and finance ought to make him a conspicuous success as Secretary of the Treasury. He took no active part in politics until the last campaign, when he was Vice-Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and owing to the illness of the Chairman the work of the campaign practically devolved upon him. Mr. McAdoo is regarded as one of the Conservative members of the Cabinet. Mr. William Wilson, the Secretary of Labour, is the John Burns of the Cabinet. He was born in Blantyre, Scotland, fifty-one years ago, and was brought to this country by his parents when he was eight years old. They settled in Pennsylvania and the next year the boy was put to work in the coal mines and earned his living as a coal miner until six years ago, when he entered Congress as a Labour member. He is one of the very few working men who have found a seat in Congress, and the only one, as I now recollect, who has sat in the Cabinet. Mr. McReynolds, the Attorney-General, has not been a politician. Although a Democrat, he was appointed by President Roosevelt an Assistant Attorney-General, and later he was special counsel for the Government in the prosecution of the Tobacco Trust. He is regarded as a lawyer of very great ability and a believer in drastic measures against the trusts.

As the public classifies the Cabinet, Mr. Bryan, the Secretary of State; Mr. McReynolds, the Attorney-General; Mr. Burleson, the Postmaster-General; Mr. Daniels, the Secretary of the Navy; Mr. Lane, the Secretary of the Interior; Mr. Redfield, the Secretary of Commerce, and Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of Labour are Radicals; Mr. McAdoo, the Secretary of the Treasury, is a Moderate; Mr. Garrison, the Secretary of War, and Mr. Houston, the Secretary of Agriculture, are not well enough known to be catalogued. It is, of course, not surprising that a majority of the members should be Radicals, or Progressives as perhaps they would prefer to be called. Mr. Wilson is a Progressive, and his is to be a Progressive Administration. He was elected on a Progressive platform, and it was the grievance of the country against Mr. Taft that he was not sufficiently Progressive to suit

the demands of the time. Presidents are often hampered in the make-up of their Cabinets by having made pledges before nomination and purchased the support of rivals by the promise of portfolios. Mr. Wilson apparently made no such bargains, and was able to constitute his Cabinet to suit his own ideas. With the exception of Mr. Bryan, whose leadership of the Party for so many years entitled him to be given anything he desired, no other member was selected, so far as surface indications point, for any other reason than that in the judgment of President Wilson he was the best man for the place.

While Mr. Wilson was listening to the cheers of the thousands acclaiming him President, Mr. Taft, quietly, almost unobserved, attended by only a few personal friends, was leaving Washington to enjoy a short holiday in the South before taking up his duties as a professor of law at Yale University. A few months ago Mr. Taft's star had fallen very low. No candidate for the Presidency had met a more crushing defeat, no man, apparently, had been so thoroughly repudiated, no one, he was told, was so much to blame as he was for his own failure and the ruin in which he had involved his Party. Then almost every one wrote "finis" to his career, and felt sure that when he left the White House he would never be heard of again in a public capacity; now a great many people are less sure than they were, and there are some persons bold enough to say that Mr. Taft has merely gone into temporary eclipse and not into perpetual obscurity. These people, who have the fortunate faculty to remember the things that happened a little longer than the day before yesterday, recall the historical parallel of Grover Cleveland. When Mr. Cleveland left the White House for the second time he was much in the position that Mr. Taft was immediately after the election last November. Four years earlier Mr. Cleveland came into office with a heavy majority and a well organised and militant Party behind him. He left the Presidency with his Party shattered, detested by the men who had made his election possible. Yet Mr. Cleveland lived long enough to regain his lost prestige, and when he passed away calumny was silenced and his real greatness was admitted. Mr. Cleveland rendered a very great service to his country. The verdict of history is recorded.

The passion of contemporary public opinion is forgotten, or if recalled it is with a feeling of shame.

Although only four months have elapsed since the election, Mr. Taft occupies a very different position to what he then did. It cannot be said that the time is long enough for passion to have cooled or for the true measure of the man to have been taken; but he has certain qualities so striking and so unusual that they cannot be obscured. For one thing, he is perhaps the most magnificent loser history has known, and this has compelled the respect of his enemies and increased the admiration of his friends. Beaten and disappointed—and naturally he wanted to be re-elected—he has gone about his work as conscientiously and as uncomplainingly as if he had won the greatest of all victories. He has shown neither resentment nor desire for revenge, he has blamed no one, neither has he tried to shift the responsibility; he has been as good-natured and as serene and philosophical as if he was at the beginning instead of at the end (even if temporarily) of his career; through it all he has borne himself with a quiet dignity that has proved his strength and force of character. As his days have been measured his popularity has increased, and yet, as the New York *Sun* justly observes:

> he is not popular for any concessions to popularity, for any mean arts of it, for any base, demagogic, unctuous, insincere conduct or policy. Victim of many malices, of one supermanlike ambition and supreme selfishness, of many misconceptions; victim, too, at times of his own amiability and of his contempt for meanness; maker of a reasonable measure of mistakes, and from the moment of his nomination the bondsman of a false position, amid insuperable difficulties he has kept straight in the path of honour.

Mr. Taft has been the victim of his own virtues. He is not a weak man, but he has often laid himself open to the accusation of weakness because of his scrupulous regard for justice and a fine chivalry that made him go to the rescue of the under dog at risk to himself. No President has any right to sacrifice himself for his Cabinet or his subordinates, or to make of friendship an idol and perish by it. Yet that is what Mr. Taft did. I need not go into details, and the chapter is now closed. A Cabinet is under moral obligation to help the President and not to injure him, but Mr. Taft's Cabinet did him very little good and a great deal of harm; yet Mr. Taft, not because he is a weak man or a

foolish man, but because he is a just man and somewhat indifferent to fleeting public opinion, did not apply the one remedy that would have been effective. But that is all in the past, and as Mr. Taft has repeatedly said in the last few months, he has no regrets and only gratitude for the good fortune that has come to him. Most Presidents have gone away from Washington with feelings of bitterness or disappointment, and have made it known they would not return; to occupy second place where once they had been first is distasteful. Mr. Taft, on the contrary, has said that he is coming back to Washington to renew old friendships and that he does not regard defeat as exile. If he continues to grow in popular estimation during the next four years in the same ratio that he has grown in the last four months, one may very well anticipate his return not as a visitor but as a resident. That, however, was not the sense in which he desired to have his words understood. He does not believe that the future holds anything in store for him politically. With that belief, for the present, we may leave him.

While Mr. Taft was unfortunate in the selection of his Cabinet, two of its members gave it a standing not exceeded in our day and leave it with reputations so firmly established, it is certain they will return to public life when to be a Conservative is no longer accounted disgraceful. Mr. Wickersham, who had no experience in public affairs, entered the Cabinet as Attorney-General with the millstone of being a "corporation lawyer" and therefore supposed to be the high protector of the "interests." The American Attorney-General, like the British Attorney-General, is prohibited from engaging in private practice while in office, and when Mr. Wickersham became the legal adviser of the Government he took only one client—the people of the United States, and he served them as faithfully as in the past he had served the corporations from whom he had accepted retainers. No man has more vigorously prosecuted the trusts than Mr. Wickersham or done more to enforce the laws. First, he was attacked by the Demagogue because it was supposed to be absurd for anyone to believe that, with his past affiliations, he could be honest in protecting the rights of the people against plutocracy; then he was attacked by plutocracy because he was

too honest in protecting the rights of the people. Now that he is indifferent either to abuse or praise justice is being done him. It is the same curious manifestation of the fickleness of public opinion that has been seen in the case of Mr. Taft. The very papers that a year or two ago were loudest in their denunciations of Mr. Wickersham now justly estimate his services, and say it will be difficult for Mr. Wilson to appoint an Attorney-General his equal in ability and courage. Mr. Wickersham came into the Cabinet practically unknown: he leaves it a great figure in national affairs.

The other member of the Cabinet who firmly established his position is Mr. Meyer, the Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Meyer was not an unknown man when Mr. Taft invited him to enter the Cabinet. He had been Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, Ambassador to Italy and then to Russia; he was Mr. Roosevelt's Postmaster-General and became Secretary of the Navy when Mr. Taft formed his Administration. In every position Mr. Meyer displayed conspicuous ability. As Ambassador to Italy he harmonised relations, as Ambassador to Russia he took an active part in the Russo-Japanese peace negotiations, as Postmaster-General he introduced several notable reforms; but it was the Navy Department that afforded the largest scope for his talents. Owing to political and other circumstances, Mr. Roosevelt had six Secretaries of the Navy, each of whom remained in the Department too short a time to familiarise himself with its work, but all of whom were inspired with the zeal of the reformer and determined to make his own administration memorable by undoing the work of his predecessor. When Mr. Meyer came in the Department was badly demoralised. He created what was in effect a General Staff for the Navy, although he encountered bitter and narrow opposition in Congress, effected economies and increased efficiency, and maintained the Fleet at the highest standard of effectiveness. He proved himself an administrator of really extraordinary ability.

It is gratifying to be able to note that President Wilson has expressed himself in favour of the Bill introduced by Senator Root to repeal that section of the Panama Canal Act which discriminates in favour of American vessels in violation of the

plain wording of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty stipulating equality of treatment for the shipping of all nations. The President's position was made known to senators of his own party prior to his inauguration; since then he has not further indicated what his course will be, and no opportunity has been afforded to Mr. Bryce to resume the negotiations with Mr. Bryan that were initiated with Mr. Knox. In the address he made to the Senate after being sworn in as Vice-President, Mr. Marshall rather pointedly reminded the Senate of its obligations to protect the national honour by the strict observance of treaty stipulations. "With neither right nor desire to infringe upon the prerogatives of the President so soon to be," he said, "all persons are agreed that under the Constitution the Senate of the United States is singularly the guardian of the people's honour," and he continued:

> When we enter the chancelleries of the world and submit to their judgments not only our right to be, but our right to be respected, we can hope to be measured in but one way; and we must be able to show that the solemn treaty obligations of this Republic will be kept with the same scrupulous honesty, both of spirit and letter, whether made with the humblest people of this continent struggling for self-government, or with the mightiest monarch of the old world. . . . The real greatness of this Republic rests upon its unsullied honour, and it is the duty of this body to search down rumours of bad faith and dishonesty and rectify wrong wherever wrong is discovered.

This may mean much or nothing. As the Vice-President has neither legislative nor executive functions his pious exhortation has no more weight than that of any other citizen; it is only important if he reflected the President and with his consent reminded the Senate of its duty as "the guardian of the people's honour." Mr. Marshall was in consultation with the President before the inauguration, the President confided to Mr. Marshall the names of the Cabinet; it is perhaps not unlikely that Mr. Marshall either read his address to him or at least outlined its tenor. But this of course is only surmise, and the public is permitted to draw its own conclusions from Mr. Marshall's words without the benefit of official assistance. The repeal of the free toll clause of the Panama Act meets with serious resistance in Congress from many Democrats. In all probability it cannot be repealed unless President Wilson makes it an administration policy; but very possibly it can be repealed if Mr. Wilson insists upon that action being taken. It rests with the President to determine what shall be done.

A. MAURICE LOW.

RESERVE OFFICERS IN THE BULGARIAN ARMY

THOSE who have recently followed the obituary columns of the Bulgarian press, or have had an opportunity of perusing the lists issued by the Bulgarian War Office, must have been struck by the large number of Reserve officers among the killed and wounded in the course of the present war. There is no exaggeration in saying that the losses suffered by this category, as compared with those of the permanent service, are nearly two to one. In order to appreciate the full significance of this fact, one must bear in mind that, with comparatively few exceptions, the Reserve officers in Bulgaria have only a casual connection with the military profession. The vast majority of them are functionaries, members of the liberal professions, or men of business. The recruitment of such a large proportion of officers among the purely civilian classes constitutes a distinctive trait of the military organisation of Bulgaria. It lends to the Bulgarian Army the colour of a national militia to whom fighting is not a professional occupation, but the fulfilment of a civic duty. The army still remains an engine of war, but the spirit which permeates it is that of the community at large, and not of a military caste.

This happy state of things is mainly due to the democratic character of the country. But it would be a mistake to attribute the system of recruiting the officers for the Reserve Army among the ordinary citizens to any preconceived policy. In the first instance, it was prompted almost entirely by financial considerations. Its soundness and utility have, however, been demonstrated by an experience of twelve years, and the results have proved so satisfactory that several foreign countries have adopted it as a model. The object of this article is to describe the general

features of this ingenious scheme and to explain its mode of operation.

For a long time, the supply of the Bulgarian Army with Reserve officers remained one of the most complicated problems which confronted the responsible authorities. The deficiency in officers during the Servo-Bulgarian War was so great that whole companies were left under the command of non-commissioned officers. As the army gradually developed and its Reserve forces automatically increased, the situation tended to become more precarious. The Military Academy of Sofia could attempt no more than keep pace with the growing needs of the Standing Army. By 1887, it had succeeded in training about 900 officers, the lower ranks then numbering nearly 24,000 men. The proportion of one officer to twenty-six men in time of peace does not differ appreciably from the present state of things (1 : 23); but to-day the army, when fully mobilised, includes thousands of Reserve officers, whereas in 1887 this latter class was practically non-existent.

A critical stage was reached in 1887, with the promulgation of the Military Act of that year, which nearly doubled the Peace and Reserve forces of the Bulgarian Army. There could be no question of proportionately increasing the number of the officers, as the modest budget of the Principality was then on the point of being burdened with the rearmament of the infantry and the artillery. The plan adopted was that in vogue in most of the Continental countries with universal service. Young men possessing secondary or University instruction and liable to military service were given the option of qualifying as officers in the Reserve Army. This system remained in force for seven years. Its failure was due to lack of proper organisation, no courses of theoretic or practical instruction being provided. The task of conferring the grades was entrusted to the various regimental and divisional classes where non-commissioned officers were trained. The candidates were left pretty much to themselves, and the examinations soon degenerated into a mockery. But the radical fault of the system lay in its containing no inducement for the recruits to avail themselves of the proffered opportunity. They were already entitled, by virtue of their education, to the privilege of serving only six or twelve months,

instead of two years, irrespective of the fact whether they qualified as Reserve officers or declined to do so. In these circumstances, what might have been expected actually took place, and many of them preferred to remain simple soldiers.

The Law on Military Service, passed in 1897, did not overlook this side of the matter and introduced several improvements. Henceforth, all Bulgarian subjects liable to military service were to spend two years under the banners. The only exception allowed was in favour of recruits holding University degrees, provided they successfully passed the examinations as officers in the Reserve Army. Failure to comply with this condition brought them also under the operation of the general rule. This innovation, which was based on French and German precedents, fully attained its object. Faced by the dilemma of serving a second year or undergoing the ordeal of an examination, the University graduates, without exception, preferred the lesser of the evils. But the case of those holding degrees of secondary education, who formed the more numerous group, was overlooked; neither was again anything done to organise a proper course of training.

This state of things continued until 1900, when the problem was tackled in earnest and a satisfactory solution at last found. The scheme eventually adopted appears now so simple, that one wonders why it took so long to discover it. Its central idea is that of the Acts of 1891 and 1897. Universal-service brings automatically every year under the jurisdiction of the military law a large contingent of young men possessing an instruction higher than that demanded of the officers of the Standing Army. There could be no question as to the excellent quality of these recruits. If the Military Academy, disposing of poorer material, could turn out efficient officers, there was no intrinsic reason why equally good results should not be obtained from men who were one day to form the brain of the country. To the objection that the Regular officers had the advantage of three years' special study, whereas the recruits in question remained in the ranks only two years or even less, the answer was that, if three years were enough to train officers for the permanent service, a considerably shorter term ought to be sufficient to prepare men of a higher education for the grade of second lieutenants in the Reserve Army.

The soundness of this contention once admitted, matters resolved themselves into a question of organisation. In the first place, it was manifest that a mode of training must be evolved which would guarantee the possession by the candidates of the technical knowledge indispensable for the performance of their future work. The originality of the scheme consisted in the way in which this was accomplished. Former experience had shown that no satisfactory results need be expected so long as the candidates for the grade of Reserve officer were incorporated with the general body of recruits. The regimental officers had neither time nor power to treat these recruits on lines differing from the ordinary routine. They had, therefore, to move within a restricted circle and to pick up the elements of the craft in the slow and leisurely fashion appropriate to the mentality of the peasant-soldier. Instead of approximating the methods followed in the military schools, their training was thus lowered to the level of barrack drill. All difficulties impeding efficient preparation would however immediately disappear, if only these young men were taken out of the ranks and constituted into a separate unit. And this was precisely what the Bulgarian War Office did in 1900. For that purpose no special intervention of the Legislature was required, as the distribution of the recruits lay within the power of the military authorities. The change was effected by a circular letter of the Minister of War, ordering the regimental commanders to despatch the recruits of the coming class who possessed secondary or University education to Sofia, where they were to be organised into a special company. The recruits, however, continued to figure in the registers of their respective regiments, whose uniform they wore, and their legal status in nowise differed from that of the ordinary soldiers.

Such were the modest origins of the Bulgarian School for Second Lieutenants for the Reserve Army. It was ushered into life in a contraband manner and retained that character for some time before any cognisance of it was taken by an Act of Parliament. In the absence of any special credits, the maintenance of the scholars during this initial stage was ensured by the ration money (40 centimes per day) which they were allowed as ordinary soldiers. In the picturesque village of Kniajevo, on the outskirts of the capital, the War Office happened to own

two tottering buildings, and these were improvised into barracks. The accommodation was of a very primitive description, a great deal of the menial work falling on the students. Lycurgus himself could have discovered nothing to banish as unnecessary luxury. But if the material comforts were rather scanty, in return the commanding personnel of the school was recruited among the most capable officers of the army. This policy has been faithfully observed ever since, and to it the brilliant success of the experiment must to a great extent be ascribed.

The programme of the studies and of the practical exercises was modelled on that of the Military Academy. At first, a pardonable mistake was made in giving too great a prominence to purely theoretical subjects which went beyond the scope of work falling to the share of a subaltern officer. Added to the considerable amount of field exercises, this made the lot of the students a very hard one and brought them to the verge of overwork. The system has since been greatly simplified, and the curriculum now includes only the strictly indispensable. The teaching staff consists of officers who have studied abroad, and their pupils being men of education, the rate of progress is astonishingly rapid. By the end of the sixth month, the course of lectures is exhausted, all the examinations have been held, and the students are left free for their practical work.

What is principally required of a subaltern officer is not so much proficiency in the higher branches of military science as capacity to lead fully trained men. The only way of acquiring the art of leadership is through personal contact with the realities of military life, which alone can give a thorough insight into the mechanism of a modern army. Such being the case, the originators of the scheme have from the very first endeavoured to make of the school a model batallion. The students are, above all, soldiers and, as such, amenable to the full rigour of military discipline, which is not altogether the case with the cadets of the Military Academy. Their life is that of the rank and file, except that it carries fuller responsibilities. The régime can best be described as one of Spartan simplicity, coupled with ceaseless activity. The entire course lasting only a year, every hour of the day is apportioned for some special task. This is especially true of the last five months, from May to October. Work begins

at 5 o'clock in the morning, and the whole time is spent in the field. What has been learned in the class-room is now exemplified by endless exercises. The proximity of the garrison of Sofia affords facilities for operations on a wider scale by means of which the future officers become familiarised with the movements of larger bodies of men. Whenever there are important army manœuvres, the students invariably take an active part in them. In this manner, by the end of the year, they obtain a complete grasp of the work which lies before them and, in the opinion of competent persons, compare very favourably with the graduates of the Military Academy.

This is only part of the training which the future officers receive. As previously explained, those who only have secondary education are liable to two years' service. After graduating at the School of Kniajevo, they are sent back to the regiments where they complete their term as non-commissioned officers. Here, under the guidance of the regular officers, they find fresh opportunities and come in touch with at least a portion of the men whom one day they may have to lead into battle. The circle of fellowship is enlarged as they periodically return to their regiments for the summer practices which coincide with the calling of the Reservists. Those candidates who possess University degrees are disbanded at the end of the school year, and, therefore, miss the benefit of this additional training. But they also have to rejoin the ranks for a period of eight or ten weeks every second or third year, financial considerations unfortunately forbidding more frequent summonses.

The results obtained during the first year were so encouraging that, in 1902, the War Office decided to double the contingent of scholars and to form a second company. In view of the constant growth of the army, the educational qualifications were for a time lowered, the number of recruits thus reaching nearly 300 per annum. The quantity, however, proved to be at the expense of the quality, and the original plan was once more resumed. The present organisation of the school rests on a Royal Decree of 1903, which has more than once been revised, and its legal status was definitely sanctioned by the great Military Act of the same year. The number of students since the opening of the school has averaged about 200, and the total output amounts

to nearly 2500 graduates, which is also the number of the officers on permanent service. In other words, the officers' staff of the Bulgarian Army has, within the brief space of some twelve years, been doubled by means of this institution.

In 1904, special courses were opened for training Reserve officers for the artillery. The students in this case were recruited exclusively among the graduates of secondary schools and the instruction lasted two years, the subject-matter being more complex. These courses were recently incorporated with the School of Kniajevo, but the period of studies remains unaltered. The methods of instruction do not differ appreciably from those already described, and the results secured have proved equally satisfactory. This is sufficiently established by the fact that the graduates are allowed, on certain conditions, to join the permanent service.

The career of this autochthonous institution has hitherto been one of uninterrupted progress. Starting from extremely modest origins, it has steadily developed until it became a regular feature of the military organisation of the country. With the recognition of its success ended the privations experienced during the earlier years. The school has now a regular budget and ensured resources which have enabled the authorities to improve the material lot of the students. Extreme simplicity, however, continues to form the keynote of the régime. The total cost of the establishment does not exceed £10,000, this sum including the salaries of the officers' staff which now consists of twenty members.

What will probably most impress a foreign visitor is not the efficiency of the training, but the spirit in which the students approach their work. It should always be remembered that they are recruited exclusively among the educated classes and comprise the flower of the young generations of the community. No greater contrast can be conceived than that between their former mode of life and the experience which they acquire within the walls of the school. The two things are contradictory terms, and it might be imagined that the transition would be a painful one. In reality, the change is effected very smoothly. After a few weeks of fretting and suppressed grumbling, the methodical regularity of a soldier's life begins to tell its tale. For young

men who have spent long years in hard study, there is a fascination in this novel atmosphere which makes reconciliation with an inevitable task a simple process. Besides, the careful selection of the candidates creates conditions favourable to genuine comradeship. The school has a distinct *esprit de corps*, and is gradually forming its traditions. Owing to the relatively high culture of its students, it imparts to the national army a fresh spirit of conscious and reasoning patriotism and enhances its moral value. All those who have followed closely recent military events agree that, in the course of the present war, no class of officers displayed a higher devotion to duty or greater bravery than these citizen-officers. The hundreds of graves, scattered throughout the Thracian battlefields, will for long bear witness to the noble service rendered by the School of Kniajevo at a critical juncture in Bulgaria's history.

A Bulgarian.

NEW YORK REVISITED

Of all the great cities of to-day, there is none which reflects so vividly as New York the changed and changing conditions of the phase of human life which dates from the invention of the steam-engine. Many centres of organised industrial industry in Europe present to the thoughtful observer special features and clearly indicated tendencies of the world's insistent problem of economic pressure, of the great changes, social and political, which have followed the passing of masses of men from agricultural to industrial pursuits, from the exploitation of the earth's fundamental life-supporting resources to the exploitation of labour; but in New York, the point at which the main stream of immigration pours into the land of promise, from those countries where the life-struggle is fiercest, pausing before it flows on into the farms and factories of the interior, the problems which confront humanity to-day and to-morrow stand out in conspicuous relief. The tide of human life, of all nations and kindreds, that surges through the deep cañon-streets between the sheer cliffs of New York's "sky-scrapers," tells its own tale, which he who runs may read. In the close-packed polyglot crowd that fills Broadway and up-town Fifth Avenue at noon, one may hear, more clearly than in London, Naples or Warsaw, the stern questions forced on the world by modern industrialism, by the last century's vast increase of population, and by its spendthrift misuse of the earth's natural resources. The swarming activities and ever-pressing necessities of this increasing invasion of workers, seeking relief from the intolerable conditions of life at Europe's congested centres, become sharply focused within the narrow limits of this greatest of American cities. For here, too, congestion and the cost of living increase apace, reflecting the swiftly changing conditions of the Continent upon which, until quite recently, Europe relied for cheap food and unlimited elbow-room.

Looking out beyond the teeming ant-hills of Hoboken, Manhattan and the Bronx, one sees, across the vast region which fifty years ago was virgin soil, the shadow of that thriftless application of human industry to unwise ends, which in Europe has increased economic pressure to the breaking-point; of the steady decline of mankind's fundamental industry of agriculture, and the concentration of human thought and labour upon manufacture and trade as the highest forms of progressive activity. From amidst this Babel throng, that comes seeking the necessities of life in a country which to-day has practically no vacant lands for future settlers, and where two-thirds of the population are already "industrial," one may discern, as clearly as in Mr. Woodrow Wilson's inaugural address, the writing on the wall, and perceive the significance of the changes which the last ten years have brought in the American nation's plans and point of view. In the daily life of this city of five millions of people, only a fifth of whom are native born, one learns something of the basic causes of that political and social unrest to which Mr. Wilson has referred with such depth of feeling; of "the fearful physical and spiritual cost to the men and women and children, upon whom the dead-weight and burden of all our industrial achievements have fallen piteously the years through." In the city of to-day, becoming before our eyes, the home of a promiscuous and discontented proletariat, we find an explanation for the heart-searchings and the disillusion which are now disturbing men's minds from the Atlantic to the Pacific; we realise that the future well-being of the ninety millions of Americans to-day—and with them of many millions of Europeans—depends, in the last analysis, not upon Constitutions, or principles of democracy, not upon the tablets and traditions of the law, not even upon the more equal distribution of existing wealth, but upon the scientific conservancy and intensive development of the earth's natural resources. In New York, where Russians, Italians, Greeks, Hungarians, Anglo-Saxons and Germans crowd together in the pursuit of daily bread, under the protection of a benevolent Government which proclaims its intention to "square every process of national life with the standards we so proudly set up at the beginning," the grim fact stands out unmistakable, that nothing can prevent the increasing pressure of population

from producing more acute distress, unless the intelligence and energies of the nation are steadily directed towards increasing the natural wealth of the country—of its mines and forests, of the sea and soil. In the cities of the Middle West one may learn the same lesson, but it is here, at the landing-place and first labour-market of the immigrant, that we are brought face to face with the most significant and undeniable symptoms of an economic pressure which must inevitably increase in the immediate future. Europe, confronted at its industrial centres by similar, and worse, conditions, has heretofore found relief in emigration. In so doing, it has transferred, and is still transferring, part of its burdens to the New World. Thirty years ago that burden was either ignored or cheerfully faced by the American people, recklessly confident in the inexhaustible resources of their Land of Promise, proudly proclaiming it as the natural refuge of the needy and the oppressed. In 1880, the American nation were still, broadly speaking, an agricultural people; to-day, less than a third of the population are engaged in agricultural pursuits, and the tide of labour has set strongly, as in Europe, from the farm to the city. The outlook of men has changed, and the promise of American life is now freely questioned by a nation which looks forward to a population of two hundred millions in 1950, and which is already becoming seriously concerned at the increasing cost of the necessities of life. In the faces of New York's crowds, in the feverish hurry and clamour of her streets, the story of the twentieth century's monstrous edifice of reckless industrialism is told, and the stern question of the future presented. It is a question whereof the solution lies not in politics, nor moralities, but wholly in scientific economics. The lesson which America is gradually learning, which the University of Wisconsin is effectively teaching, is that only by husbandry of the soil can the modern world hope to bear the burden of its population, vastly augmented as it is by reason of our poor laws, our scientific hygiene and other philanthropic activities. It is a lesson which the whole world must perforce learn in the hard school of adversity.

From the 1910 Report of the Census Bureau, it appears that the city of New York to-day contains 4,766,883 citizens, of whom only 921,000 are pure-bred Americans. For the rest, 750,000 are of British parentage; 740,000 hail from Germany and the

north-west of Europe; 1,705,000 come from Russia, Italy Austria and the south-eastern countries; and 550,000 are of mixed parentage. These figures become more significant when we remember that in New York there are more Irishmen than in Dublin and Cork put together; nearly as many Italians as there are in Rome; more Germans than in Dresden or Munich, and more Russians than in Odessa. More than a million of New York's inhabitants speak Yiddish as their mother-tongue; in other words, there are more Jews in this American city than have ever been gathered together in any place since the dispersion of the tribes. Within the city limits there exist self-contained communities of men who speak the languages and follow the traditions of their homelands in Central Europe. In the co-operative flats of Eleventh Avenue, from 34th to 48th Street, in the tribal warrens of the Middle-west Side, Slavs, Hungarians, Croatians, Dalmatians, Servians, Bohemians and Greeks live their alien and laborious lives, mixing little or not at all with the Anglo-Saxon, many of them returning eventually to Europe with the savings of half a lifetime. In the last twenty years, these immigrants from South-Eastern Europe have taken the places of the Irish and Germans who formerly handled freight at the railroads and on the water front, whose numbers are falling off, in comparison with the tide of immigration from South-Eastern Europe, and who have accordingly moved up in the social scale. It is impossible to contemplate without apprehension the changes which have taken place in the raw material that now goes to the making of American citizens, and the probable submersion of the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian and Teutonic races by hordes of Slav, Semitic and Illyric stock. The centre of European emigration to the United States has swiftly shifted in the last thirty years from the North Sea, first to the Adriatic and now to the Black Sea; so that to-day the country is being filled with the overflow of races and kindreds whose religious and political ideals are almost as far removed from the old American standards as those of the disfranchised negro or the excluded Asiatic. In the last ten years, New York's British and German citizens have decreased by 400,000, while the number of Russians, Poles and Finns has increased by more than that total. Can even "God's own country" continue to assimilate material of this kind and yet retain that "Anglo-Saxon impulse" which President Butler

of Columbia University defines as "the underlying and controlling fact in American life"?

Six years ago, we were warned of "the possibility of a rich industrial and mercantile aristocracy dominating a darker-haired, darker-eyed, uneducated proletariat from Central and Eastern Europe." Since those words were written, the United States has seen the quickening of a new spirit of national consciousness; there has been a summoning of the younger generation into fields of civic and patriotic duty; at the same time, widespread throughout the land, there has arisen a spirit of questioning and disillusion, of distaste for the fair-seeming but bitter fruits of commercialism, a spirit of constructive criticism and united effort, which to-day animates the rank and file of the Progressive Party. The civic life of New York, because of its kaleidoscopic population reflects this spirit, this latest manifestation of the Anglo-Saxon impulse, less conspicuously, perhaps, than the States and cities of the North and Middle West; nevertheless, "the Wisconsin idea" has worked steadily eastwards. Its semi-Teutonic influence may be traced here, in political and social economics, as plainly as the effects of the triumphant eastward progress of the Woman Suffrage movement. The Progressives' doctrine of "social service," their national and local ideals of public duty and civic responsibility, may seem, to a casual observer, to have achieved but little against the powers of darkness in New York's high places, against the sordid materialism of "big business," the cynical corruption of Tammany and the organised forces of officially protected evil-doers; but those who look closer see in the "New Democracy" new forces of law and order, definite national purposes shaping themselves to works of social reorganisation. They see the younger generation, and especially its University men, in New York as in Detroit, keenly alive to the needs and dangers of the immediate future: the passing of the prosperous but purblind individualism of the pioneer days; and the evolution of an aristocracy of intelligence and patriotism, which is slowly but surely sending honourable and efficient workers into politics and civic affairs. Even in the ranks of the plutocracy, and amongst the leisured class which spends its summers in Europe, there are unmistakable signs of a general modification of the attitude which, in the past, has left American institutions to the tender mercies of the boss and the ward-heeler. In the

spirit of the Progressive movement lie the hopes of the future and the solution of its economic problems.

The average decent citizen, in Manhattan and in Brooklyn, is visibly impressed by the vastness and complexity of the problems which now confront him daily. He sees the undisciplined socialism of a polyglot proletariat turned to organised terrorism by its leaders; he sees the White Man's burden looming darkly in the foreign policy of a country which must of necessity provide future markets for the surplus products of its industrial labourers; he watches the steadily increasing cost of the necessities of life; and his attitude is accordingly sobered and thoughtful. Patriotic Americans have come to the knowledge that the promise of American life is by no means a matter of manifest destiny, but of education and effort. Hence it is that, among the intellectual *élite* of New York, at the centres of activity where the Anglo-Saxon impulse is chiefly felt, the characteristic American outlook towards a glorious future, the outlook of the days when, as Carlyle said, "there was a great deal of land for a very few people," has manifestly been tempered by the growth of a spirit which looks about and even backwards, for relief; which does not hesitate to improve its democratic institutions by study and adoption of the political economics of Germany and Great Britain. This attitude is as clearly reflected in the best American literature of the last five years as it is in the Progressive politics of all parties in the State. The old indomitable courage of the pioneers is there, the splendid optimism and chivalrous idealism of the American tradition, but with it all a new and sober sense of the burdens and dangers common to humanity in this overcrowded planet, and of good citizens' collective responsibility of public duty. It is no doubt true of New York as a whole, that the movement for nationalising reform, with which Mr. Roosevelt's name is chiefly associated, fails to carry an effective appeal in certain quarters. This is only natural, for the "New Democracy" of the Reformers is rather a social and economic, than a political, renaissance; it aims at substituting new social relations, new standards of human excellence and happiness, for the standard of financial success; and its initiative here is partly due to an altruistic sense of social guilt amongst those who realise the significance of the latest developments of world-wide economic pressure.

Effective initiative, and coherence in a movement of this

sort, can hardly be expected to develop very rapidly in a city like New York, where the masses of the electorate are necessarily lacking in the united purposes of communities that possess a common origin and traditions of education. Thus, the notable activities of New York's plutocracy in the fields of philanthropy and social service, and the beneficent utterances of the politicians and press who serve it, have frequently the appearance of being inspired rather by a sense of impending necessity than by force of present conviction. New York, the melting-pot of American civilisation, where the strongholds of the millionaire face the headquarters of immigrant labour, still displays less evidence of synthetic effort, less original and compelling thought in the work of reorganisation and reform, than the comparatively homogeneous cities of the Middle West. *Eppur se muove.* In a *sense, the city is before all else an industrial clearing-house,* raw labour's market-place, where the "have-nots" and their children are hired for the service of the "haves"; it is still the chosen stamping-ground of the vice-protecting politician, and the breeding-place of a peculiarly vicious type of criminal. The crowded squalor of the tenements, the grimy untidiness of the suburbs, seem even to refute the hopes of Democracy, when contrasted with the magnificence of Fifth Avenue, the opulent splendours of the new Railway termini and the city's latest palatial buildings. Yet, granting all this, because of the vigour of her traditions and ideals, because of her very financial supremacy and its power of attraction, New York possesses qualities of intellectual and moral strength which in the end should place her in the vanguard of reform. Undoubtedly her culture is more catholic and generous than that of most American cities, and in her civic life there are unmistakable signs of "uplifting" influence steadily moulding public opinion. The spokesmen and interpreters of social and economic reform in New York have to contend with mighty forces, both under King Mammon and King Demos—there are Augean stables to be cleansed in Wall Street as at police headquarters—but no one can study the signs of the times without sharing the enthusiasm of the Progressives, who believe that the shadows which now lie across the path of the Empire State will vanish before the light of the New Democracy; that New York's aspirations and achievements may yet serve to guide the world out of some of its afflictions.

Certainly, as one watches the dense crowds that throng the up-town pavements from 32nd to 10th Street at midday, as one realises that millions more in South-Eastern Europe are preparing to swell that throng, there is hope and comfort in the new vision, with which, as Mr. Wilson has said, the leaders of thought in America are approaching the new conditions created by economic pressure.

Meanwhile, there is probably no place on earth (except it be the Galata Bridge at Constantinople) where life reflects more vividly than it does in New York that pressure, the complexity of the modern world and its increasing migrations of hunger-driven humanity. Even in Fifth Avenue, when the fine flower of civilisation's most resplendent plutocracy takes the air, at the Opera House on a gala night, in the fashionable restaurants of the Great White Way, or amidst the dignified splendour of New York's club world, it is impossible to escape the obsession of this wholesale process of mankind in the re-making; of the million Jews, the half-million Italians, and all the rest of the flotsam raw material which ebbs and flows about the base of this splendid structure of materialism. In the life of the streets, one feels rather than sees this unprecedented cosmopolitanism ; feels it as a vague menace in the background of the city's visible English-speaking prosperity ; one hears the confused murmur of its diverse tongues beyond the familiar voices of the English-speaking pulpit, press and stage. The newly imported immigrant conforms rapidly to the American type in clothing and demeanour, so that the crowds of the Brooklyn subway or at Coney Island appear more homogeneous and less picturesque than those of a holiday crowd in Moscow or Naples : Babel is partly concealed by the uniformity of ready-made clothing. Yet one feels instinctively a restlessness in the air—a sense of the instability of these unassimilated millions, who have yet to find their ultimate vocations and their homes.

This vague impression is intensified, no doubt, by the fact that only a comparatively small number of old people and children are to be seen in the every-day crowd of the streets. It is a well-fed and decently dressed crowd of able-bodied humanity, containing, even in its lowest strata, little or none of the pitiful human wreckage, victims of unemployment and disease and drink, that one sees in the submerged tenth of Europe. Indeed, to any one familiar with the hopeless human refuse of cities such as

Liverpool, Glasgow and Belfast, the rarity of public drunkenness and social derelicts in America naturally suggests the question, are the emigrants from Ireland, Russia and Scandinavia recruited exclusively from the self-respecting sober classes, or does the American climate eradicate, as some maintain, the excessive use of alcoholic stimulants amongst the labouring community?

Of the things that differentiate the outward life of English-speaking New York from that of other cities, of the material phenomena that are local and typical, probably the most surprising at first sight, in a land where "speeding-up" has attained to the dignity of a national creed, is the lingering presence of the hansom-cab. In London, where it survives, existing on sentimental conservatism and the chances of taxi-cab strikes, it is already an anachronism; but here it seems to be still a part of the established order, and prosperous. It is only when one has endured the evil-smelling, rickety taxi-cab of New York and suffered its outrageous extortions, that the mystery of the hansom is explained. The mystery of the American taxi remains unsolved, for why should a people which can swamp Europe with serviceable cars at low prices continue to allow the streets of its chief city to be monopolised by obsolete automobiles of French manufacture? And, even allowing for the high cost of living (which many New Yorkers complacently regard as a proof of prosperity) there is no sense or purpose in a public vehicle which costs roughly sixpence a minute in ordinary traffic.

The cost of living, gauged by European standards, is indisputably high, but it is only within the last few years that the production of food-stuffs has failed to keep pace with the increase in population, and that the labouring classes have begun to feel the strain on their housekeeping budgets. Until a few years ago, the citizens of the Great Republic might be paying dearly for their luxuries, but at least daily bread and the play-houses cost no more than in Europe, while wages were far higher. To-day, even "bread and the circus" are threatened; whilst immigration on the present scale must sooner or later affect wages.

One of the most interesting phenomena of New York life, peculiarly suggestive of the mingling of races, is to be observed in the world which amuses itself by night in the fashionable restaurants of the Great White Way, where, in the intervals

of supper and professional "turns," the guests take the floor and dance their turkey-trots and tangoes with unflagging enthusiasm and enjoyment. Opinions may differ as to the physical and moral effects of rag-time on communities; the broken rhythms of this Transatlantic music may signify tarantism in the blood or merely the *jôie de vivre* adapting itself *tant bien que mal* to environment. Of this, let the doctors decide: but it is certain that the dancing of the people, by the people, for the people, at these restaurants has all the appearance of sane, respectable and healthy recreation, despite the limited space and smoke-laden air; and it is a form of recreation which could no more originate with an unleavened Anglo-Saxon stock than the part-singing which one sometimes hears in clubs frequented by American University men. The average American's lack of self-consciousness, a blessing resultant from race fusion and Continental traditions of education, surely accounts for much of the genuine good-fellowship that distinguishes American democracy.

Of the surface phenomena and problems of New York life which have become emphasised within the last ten years, those which chiefly impressed me were the ubiquity and growing influence of the Jew in every walk of life; the inadequacy of existing means of locomotion to cope with the ever increasing congestion of traffic in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Hoboken; the nightmare-hideousness of Brooklyn and the suburbs of Long Island; the gradual disappearance of the once-picturesque Chinese quarter as a haunt of criminals and a tourist attraction; the extraordinary popularity of the moving-picture craze; and the insoluble problem of the Police force, notoriously identified as it is with the protection of vice and crime. New York appears to have definitely accepted as an incurable deformity the shabby-genteel dinginess of Brooklyn (a bloated Bloomsbury, aggravated by the noise and gloom of the elevated railway and unspeakable hoardings) and the squalid untidiness of the suburbs; Tammany politics and police scandals are evils which time and Mr. Roosevelt may be expected to eradicate: but the growing numbers and racial solidarity of the Jews seem to create a vague uneasiness, foreshadowing the growth of an old problem on new soil.

J. O. P. BLAND.

BOY LABOUR AND EDUCATION

The evils of boy labour can be traced to the divorce of working life and education. Juvenile labour is at present uneducational; it is a department of the labour market and not a preparation for adult life. A boy's work has got into one groove and his education into another; the regulation of his work, in so far as it is regulated at all, falls in the main to one department of the State, his education to another. The result is that his work interferes with his education, while he is at school, and prevents his education afterwards.

In the best days of apprenticeship work and education went hand in hand. When apprenticeship was made the only door of entry to trade and manufacture, there was, in effect, set up a system of compulsory technical training on a large scale; and the training was thorough, for it was the rule that apprentices should not be taken for short periods, or for one branch only of a trade. Much more than technical training was given; the master was placed *in loco parentis* and was responsible for the upbringing of the apprentice, who lived in his house and under his control. When the apprentice had served his time, he was a trained workman with a reasonable prospect of finding an opening in the trade which he had learnt, because the guilds limited the number of apprentices which a master might take (just, as in modern times, trade unions have done), with the result that some balance was preserved between the number of boys entering a trade and the number who could find employment in it as adults.

The great expansion of English trade during the eighteenth century, and the new conditions which the growth of machinery and of the factory system introduced, were fatal to apprenticeship. The restrictions of the Statute of Artificers were contrary to the

spirit of that age, and the Act, after being long evaded, was repealed in 1814. The personal tie between master and apprentice had disappeared; the guilds had lost their power, and trade unions had not yet taken their place; the doctrine of *laissez faire* reigned supreme.

Boy labour and education now became completely separated. Children were regarded as units in the labour market, their business being simply to earn their means of subsistence; it was thought cruel to prevent their doing so by limiting the hours of work. Labour, like trade, had to be free (free trade really meaning cheap and unprotected labour). In Cobden's words, "the legislature ought not to be suffered to interfere with the freedom of the labour of the people." In such an atmosphere it is not surprising that "it took twenty-five years of legislation to restrict a child of nine to a sixty-nine hour week, and that only in cotton mills." *

The appalling conditions of industrial labour revealed in the Parliamentary Reports of 1804 and onwards do not seem to have shaken the complacent optimism of the Manchester School. In the proposal to establish a ten-hour day for women and young persons in textile mills, Cobden could see only "the Socialist doctrine of fools." It was left to Tories like Michael Sadler and Lord Ashley to push through factory reform in the teeth of the Free Traders, just as it fell to a Tory Prime Minister to complete the first era of factory legislation by the consolidating Act of 1878.

By the close of the nineteenth century an elaborate code for the protection of boy labour in factories and workshops had been evolved; but the legislature still treated boy labour as a department by itself; it asked, and to a large extent solved, the question—how are boys in factories and workshops to be safeguarded from abuses, from ill-treatment and physical injury, from overwork and unhealthy conditions of labour?—but it did not ask the further question—"how is boy labour to be made a preparation for after life?"

It is true that universal education was started in the nineteenth century, but education was made a department of its own and not brought into any systematic relation with a boy's working life. The legislature never looked at education from the point of view of boy labour, or boy labour from that of education,

* Walpole. *History of England*, vol. iii. p. 203.

and it is this separation of working life from education which accounts, as I have said, for the conditions which prevail to-day.

The education given in the elementary schools is not a satisfactory preparation for adult working life. The Majority Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws speaks of "one criticism that has been made with almost absolute unanimity. There seems to be, outside the circle of the teaching profession, a very strong feeling that the education of our children in elementary schools is not of the kind which is helpful to them in after life." The Consultative Committee of the Board of Education put their finger on what is perhaps the weakest spot of our present curriculum when they stated that—"the one outstanding fact is the need for more hand-work."

On the other hand working life is allowed to interfere with education. There are still some 48,000 children employed on the half-time system, under which a child of twelve may have spent over five hours in the heat of the spinning-room or the noise of the weaving shed before beginning the lessons of the day. It is not only the education of the half-timers that suffers, but the progress of the rest of the class as well, because, as the Government's report of 1909 states, "the whole class tends to have the pace reduced to that of the slowest children." In addition to half-timers, it is calculated that there are 200,000 children working for wages out of school hours. In many cases, no doubt, the work is light and no harm is done, but where the hours are long or the occupation fatiguing, it is clear that, even if health does not suffer, education must be retarded by the effects of employment which necessarily begins early or ends late. There is evidence that health may suffer, *e.g.* the report of the L.C.C. School Medical Officer for 1906 states, as a result of an examination of 400 boys, that anæmia, deformities, nerve and heart strain increase with every increase of the hours worked out of school. As to the effect on character, it has been conclusively established that one common form of employment for school children—that of street trading—has a disastrous effect. The matchseller tends to become a beggar, the newspaper-seller a gambler, and both to drift into unemployment and crime. Of 550 boys under sixteen engaged in street selling in Birmingham in July 1901, 419 had been prosecuted for various offences during the previous six months.

Equally serious and more widespread, are the evils of juvenile labour in the case of those who have left school. For the great majority education is at an end. There are calculated to be 171,000 children between the ages of twelve and fourteen, 443,000 of fourteen years, 523,000 of fifteen and 532,000 of sixteen, attending no form of week day school or classes. To educational neglect is added, in the case of boys in towns, the evils of "blind-alley" occupations. An enormous proportion of boys (estimated by the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws at between seventy and eighty per cent.), enter unskilled occupations on leaving school. The hours are often long; the work affords no training of mind, body or character; in a few years, just at the time when he begins to want a man's subsistence, the boy is turned away to make room for another boy at lower wages. He has forgotten what he learnt at school and acquired no useful knowledge in its place. He has to start afresh, deprived of the one quality which has hitherto given him a value in the labour market—the cheapness of his labour. The results are to be seen in the startling reports of Distress Committees. In Glasgow nearly twenty per cent. of men applying for help were under twenty-five, and half of the applicants were under thirty-five. Taking the whole country, it appears that something like fifteen per cent. of the men in distress are under twenty-five, and nearly one-third of the whole are under thirty. The Majority Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws stated that this aspect of boy labour "is perhaps the most serious of the phenomena which we have encountered in our study of unemployment." "There is no subject," said the Minority Report, "as to which we have received so much and such conclusive evidence as upon the extent to which thousands of boys, from lack of any sort of training for industrial occupations, grow up almost inevitably so as to become chronically unemployed or under-employed, and presently to recruit the ranks of the unemployable"; and in another passage: "This perpetual recruitment of the unemployable by tens of thousands" of these boys is "perhaps the gravest of all the grave facts which the Commission has laid bare."

The evils of boy labour are indeed patent; they have been investigated and exposed during the last few years, not only by experts dealing with the subject from special points of vantage,

but by a great variety of official reports on every aspect of the question. Tentative steps have been taken to deal with portions of the problem in the Employment of Children Act 1903, the establishment of Juvenile Advisory Committees in connection with Labour Exchanges, and the Education (Choice of Employment) Act 1910.

But a much bigger step is needed. The problem must be faced as a whole; the education and the work of boys must be considered in relation to each other. The question must be asked and answered—how is the life of boys (and girls too) to be so ordered as adequately to prepare them for the work of adult life? Once this point of view is accepted and acted on, many of the anomalies of the present system will disappear. It will be impossible to justify the continuance of a system under which in some parts of the country children can obtain exemption at the age of eleven, in other parts partial exemption at twelve, while about a quarter of the country attendance is practically obligatory up to fourteen, because exemption cannot be obtained except by boys who have reached the seventh standard. The minimum age for leaving the elementary school ought to be fixed at fourteen; and no exemptions should be allowed, except perhaps for children beneficially employed in agriculture and continuing their education during the winter months. This change would, of course, do away with the half-time system. It should not be forgotten that half-time was established originally in the interest of factory children; it was a device of the reformers to obtain for them educational facilities before the days of universal education. It is now an anachronism; it is almost entirely confined to certain textile industries in the North; it has been condemned by the Government Enquiry of 1909, and it ought to be abolished. It is useless, however, to extend the period of attendance at day school, if the value of the education given there is to be impaired or destroyed by the work performed outside. The provisions of the Employment of Children Act 1903 must be made effective, so as to put a stop to exhausting and demoralising employments out of school hours.

By a thorough revision of the curriculum of the elementary schools, and by extending and strengthening existing legislation in the directions above indicated, the educational interests of children would be safeguarded up to the age of fourteen. But the

State cannot stop there; it must not part with all control just when control is most needed—at the age when boys of another class are beginning their public school life. It cannot look idly on while the children, which it has trained at great cost, are forgetting all that they learnt at school, either by doing nothing at all, or by spending their time in occupations which teach nothing good and lead to nothing. The same authority which has had charge of a boy's education up to the age of fourteen should complete its work by retaining his name on the school register till he is seventeen and seeing that he receives during adolescence some form of training and supervision. No boy should be allowed to leave school except to go into regular employment of a suitable character, and when working life begins education should not cease. Where work is uneducational it might be supplemented by Continuation Classes. The Education Authority will need wide discretionary powers; there must be no strait-waistcoat into which every boy is to be forced regardless of his occupation, capacity or ambitions; the amount and character of the training to be given must be suited to the needs of the individual. Employers, work-people and parents should be consulted as to subjects in which instruction is to be given and as to the hours at which classes can be most conveniently held. In supervising its charges the Education Authority must obtain all the assistance that it can from Juvenile Advisory Committees of the Labour Exchanges, managers of boys' clubs and voluntary workers of all kinds.

Some limitation of working hours will be the necessary corollary. It is worse than useless to insist that a twelve-hour working day shall be followed by evening classes. If education is given at all, it must be given under such circumstances that boys can take advantage of it. The necessary limitations should be imposed by each local authority after consultation with representatives of local employers and workmen, and subject to the sanction of the Board of Education.

A difficulty arises in the very large class of boys employed as van boys, &c., whose hours are exceedingly long and cannot well be curtailed; the boy must be out as long as the van. It may be necessary to deal, in the first instance, with such employments by keeping boys at the day-school up to the age of fifteen rather than allow them to undertake such unskilled labour as does not admit of attendance at Continuation Classes.

Physical training is required as well as mental and manual training, and training of character no less. For both purposes no better instrument could be devised than the Cadet Corps system, which has long been popular in the Dominions and has recently been made compulsory in Australia and New Zealand. A course of training in a Cadet Corps, accompanied by medical inspection, would be of immense value to the national physique and moral; it would develop just those qualities of steadiness, discipline and responsibility in which the town-bred boy is most deficient, and it would be the best corrective for the premature freedom which he at present enjoys. Cadet Corps should be organised in connection with the Continuation Classes, in which physical and military training would form part of the curriculum. *Esprit de corps* would be developed by company and battalion competitions, and the school would become something much more than a place of compulsory education when it grows to be associated in a boy's mind with the command of a section of cadets, rivalry at the shooting range, and, above all, a week in camp.

To sum up: (1) The curriculum in the elementary schools should be overhauled with a view to making it an adequate preparation for a boy's working life. (2) The minimum age for obtaining exemption should be raised to at least fourteen (with a possible exception in favour of agriculture). (3) Training should be continued under the supervision of the Education Authority up to the age of seventeen. (4) Work out of school should not be allowed to interfere with work in school. (5) A system of State-aided Cadet Corps should be established.

It is probably advisable that, in the first instance, it should be left to Local Authorities to make attendance at Continuation Classes compulsory in order to give time for the necessary machinery of committees and classes to be built up gradually, but it should be made the statutory duty of all local Education Authorities to provide educational facilities for all boys under seventeen who require them.

There are, of course, difficulties to be faced, among which the first is the question of cost. The Consultative Committee of the Board of Education estimated the maximum additional cost (to the rates and Exchequer) of raising the school age to fourteen at £490,000 annually, and from figures submitted in their Report it appears that to provide *all* boys between the ages of fourteen

and seventeen with instruction in Continuation Classes would cost an additional £1,300,000 a year. In neither case is allowance made for new premises, and in the latter estimate no provision is made for girls; many girls on leaving school require, no doubt, further training no less than boys, but their needs are different and lie outside the scope of this article. The above figures allow for no exemptions at all; a beginning might be made for a much smaller sum in the larger urban areas where it is most needed.

The cost undoubtedly would be great, but not so great as the wastage which it is designed to check. It has been calculated that the sums spent on the education of a London boy would, if invested annually and accumulated amount to over £100 by the time he leaves the elementary school.* This State-created capital is being frittered away on "tens of thousands of boys who, through neglect to provide them with suitable industrial training, may almost be said to graduate into unemployment as a matter of course." † Sooner or later they again become a charge upon the community. The extra money spent would not only be a good investment; it would safeguard the State's existing investments.

The cost of cadet training for boys who have left the elementary school has been estimated by Sir Ian Hamilton, on the basis of Australian and Natalian figures, at £1 ahead per annum. At that rate to train *all* boys between the ages of fourteen and seventeen would cost nearly £1,000,000. This figure, again, allows for no exemptions. Expenditure on Cadet Corps can be justified on military as well as on educational grounds. A system of Cadet Corps should help to solve the problem of the home army, for it certainly would improve incalculably the material from which the home army, however recruited, would be drawn.

Secondly there are the objections of employers and parents. "Every raising of the school age or Factory Act limiting child labour has been in turn objected to as fatal to industry, but the community has very quickly adapted itself to the new conditions." ‡ I know from my experience as a member of the Home Office Committee which has been enquiring into

* *Boy Labour and Apprenticeship*, by R. Bray, p. 127.

† *Poor Law Commission Report*, vol. i. p. 1167.

‡ Mr. Cyril Jackson. *Report on Boy Labour*, p. 31.

the question of the night work of boys in factories, that there are trades where the objection cannot be lightly dismissed, trades such as the glassmaking industry, where both masters and men contend that a very small increase in the cost of production would be fatal in the face of the present foreign competition. It may be necessary to answer that work which sacrifices the interests of boys must at all costs stop, though, for my own part, I hold that the sane answer is to put such a tariff on foreign goods as will enable manufacturers to dispense with some of their cheap labour and still hold their own.

I know, too, that it may be urged that any reduction in the hours of labour for boys may lead to reduction in their earnings, and hard cases of parents, largely dependent on their children's wages, will be pleaded. But the vicious circle will never be broken, if the father, because he is poor, is to be allowed to condemn his son, in his turn, to the poverty of the unskilled labourer. The loss of wages, in any case, could not be great, (seeing that boys would probably not be asked to attend classes for more than five or six hours a week), and I believe that the majority of parents would be found to acquiesce, once they realised that increased training meant increased earning power in the future.

The Government have promised an Education Bill. Is it to be merely a party sop? or is it to be a genuine effort to make the coming generation more fitted to play its part in a democratic state, and to face the increasing competition of an industrialised world? If it is to be an Education Bill in anything more than name, it must deal with the pressing question of boy labour. There is no excuse for delay; the evils of boy labour are not a matter of opinion; they have been established beyond controversy by official investigation. All authorities are agreed that the remedy is to be found in further and better juvenile training, mental, moral and physical. Boy labour and education must, again, go hand in hand. We cannot go far wrong so long as we hold fast to the principle which the Middle Ages recognised and the nineteenth century forgot—that boy labour should be regarded not as an end in itself, but only as a preparation for the lifework of the man.

WALDORF ASTOR.

GREATER BRITAIN AND INDIA

CANADIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Winston Churchill's letters dealing with the nature and cost of the plant and its personnel for constructing warships and with the cost of creating and maintaining two fleet units have been eagerly seized on by the Opposition in the Canadian House of Commons. It is utterly unfair, of course, to accuse the First Lord of the Admiralty of forcing his advice on the Canadian people and so interfering indirectly in a Canadian Party issue. The letters were written in reply to Mr. Borden's definite requests for information in regard to the difficulties attending the construction of modern warships in its earlier stages and, more particularly, for a criticism of estimates made by an officer in the Canadian Naval Service (not of any estimates adduced in support of the Liberal Resolution suggesting the provision of two fleet units) at Mr. Borden's instigation. It is absurd to contend, either that Mr. Churchill has ignored the Constitutional etiquette governing the relations between the British Government and the Dominions, or that Mr. Borden has exceeded the authority of a Canadian Prime Minister in seeking technical information in the only quarter whence it could be obtained expeditiously. Nevertheless, the Opposition, in its desire to manufacture the form of fudge known as Party capital, has made use of this contention and is likely to persist in using it as a pretext for the attempt to force an appeal to the Canadian electorate by means of continuous obstruction—a Party device hitherto wisely avoided by both historic parties in Canada. One is bound to admit, however, that some of the passages in Mr. Churchill's letters are likely to offend the *amour propre* of the captains of Canadian industry in that they seem to have been written in ignorance of the high degree of energy and skill shown by Canadian ship-builders of late years

in extending their business. There is no such word as "impossible" in the lexicon of industrial Canada, which, as everybody who has visited the manufacturing towns of Ontario will admit, combines in its operations (the profits of which are guaranteed by a tariff which reserves the home market for local enterprise) the thoroughness of British workmanship with the quick-witted adaptability and scientific organisation of American undertakings. The difficulties which prevent the expeditious building of battleships by Austria-Hungary and Spain (to take two examples to which Mr. Churchill's first letter refers) would be speedily overcome in Canada. The personal expression of opinion in the last paragraph of this letter:

> Taking the above points into consideration, it is clear that it would be wholly unwise for Canada to attempt to undertake the building of battleships at the present moment. The cost of laying down the plant alone would at a rough estimate be approximately £15,000,000, and it could not be ready for four years. Such an outlay could only be justified on the assumption that Canada is to keep up a continuous naval building programme to turn out a succession of ships after the fashion of the largest shipyards in Great Britain and Europe—

should certainly have been omitted. If Canada decided to build her own warships, the capital required for laying down the plant could be secured in a single day. It is not for Mr. Churchill or any other member of the British Cabinet, which is not precisely a committee of business men, to say whether it would be wise or unwise for Canada to enter on such an undertaking at the present moment. Sooner or later she must do so; the sooner the better for the Admiralty which is hampered by the congestion at present obtaining in British shipyards. It has not escaped the attention of Canadian observers of Naval affairs that Mr. Churchill's five-ship programme for the year is actually a two-ship programme because no progress worth mentioning can be made during the next twelve months with the three battleships that are to be built by contract. When the three Canadian "Dreadnoughts" are voted, it will probably be found that more than four years will elapse before they are ready to be placed in commission. Australia proposes to build her warships at Cockatoo Island, and there is no reason in the nature of things why Canada, whose industrial resources are more extensive, should not follow her example. In the later paragraphs

of his second letter Mr. Churchill deals with the twofold question of trained personnel which is really the root of the whole matter:

5. Apart from the reply to your immediate question, it seems desirable to comment on another point. The Admiralty will, of course, loyally endeavour to facilitate the development of any practicable naval policy which may commend itself to Canada; but the prospect of their being able to co-operate to any great extent in manning the units is now much less than it would have been at the time of the Imperial Conference of 1909.

6. It must be remembered that the new German Navy Law has necessitated a large increase in the number of ships which his Majesty's Government must keep in commission, and all our manning resources are now strained to their utmost limits, more especially as regards lieutenants, specialist officers (gunnery, torpedo, and navigation), and the numerous skilled professional ratings which cannot be improvised, or obtained except by years of careful training. . . . The case of the Australian unit stands on a different footing, for its establishment directly relieves the British vessels hitherto maintained on the Australian station, thus ultimately setting free a considerable number of men. Looking to the far greater manning difficulties which now exist than formerly in 1909, the establishment of two such Canadian units would place a strain upon the resources of the Admiralty which, with all the will in the world, they could not undertake to meet during the next few years.

8. It must further be borne in mind that the rapidity with which modern ships deteriorate, unless maintained in the highest state of efficiency by unremitting care and attention, is very marked. The recent experience of certain South American States in regard to vessels of the highest quality has been most painful, and has led to deplorable waste of money, most of which would probably have been avoided if care had been taken to supply at the time the ships were commissioned adequate refitting establishments and staffs of skilled and experienced personnel, both afloat and ashore.

The last paragraph should have been omitted. The shiftless methods of the Latin-American Republics, whose warships are ill-found and ill-kept in many cases, are not likely to be followed in the Canadian Naval Service. Nevertheless, Mr. Churchill is to be commended for pointing out in this and his previous letter that Canada, if she chooses to build for herself, must be prepared not only to man her vessels, but also to provide the experts and trained labour required for constructing warships and their special equipment. Altogether apart from the emergency contribution proposed by the Borden Administration as an object-lesson in practical Imperialism to any and every predatory Power, this question of personnel must be faced by Canada in the near future when, as Mr. Borden has promised, a permanent naval policy must be framed and carried out. Canada's contributions to the stock of Imperial sea-Power will lose much of this net value

if she (1) denudes British shipyards of specially trained mechanics by the offer of higher wages and (2) cannot man her ships without increasing the strain, already almost intolerable, on the resources of the Admiralty, which finds it more difficult every year to provide crews for the ships already in commission. As regards the personnel of a Canadian shipyard for the construction of warships and their equipment there is reason to believe that Mr. Churchill's fears are exaggerated. Canada could obtain many specially trained workers she would require from the United States, and, seeing that the Canadian mechanic is a highly intelligent person who is willing and able to learn a new job, she could manufacture the rest of the skilled labour required from her own resources. The second problem—that of manning her vessels—is not so easily solved. It has never been faced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, though he still affects to believe that there is an adequate supply of seamen at hand in maritime Canada and eager to be recruited.

As the failure to obtain more than a handful of recruits (many of whom promptly deserted) for the Canadian Naval Reserve obviously proves, Canada could not possibly man a single fleet unit with Canadians. But if she were to enter into an arrangement with Newfoundland, the greatest nursery of seamen in the Empire, the problem might be solved without importing seamen from Great Britain. The Newfoundland Government, which is anxious to participate in the naval defence of the Empire, has already approached the British Government with that object in view. The fact was mentioned in the speech from the throne (delivered by the new Governor, Mr. Walter Davidson, C.M.G., on March 5 at the opening of the legislature) which comments on the prosperity of the island and announces a reduction of $400,000 in the annual taxation. The only other solution that suggests itself involves a measure of compulsory service (suitable recruits to be drafted into the Navy), and I cannot see Sir Wilfrid and his friends advocating such a course.

If it were possible to take the Liberal suggestion of fleet units seriously, one would advise a compromise. The old, foolish cry of Canada's threatened autonomy is once more being raised. The following pronouncement from the *Toronto Globe* (which has not yet quite grasped the fact that it is in opposition, the

Liberal Party being down and out) shows clearly enough the form anti-Imperialism is assuming in the Liberal campaign:

> The reorganisers of the British Empire have come out into the open and the greatest political battle in Canada since Confederation has begun. It can be settled only at the polls after the people have opportunity of learning how great and epoch-making are the issues raised by Mr. Borden's Navy Bill. There is no longer even the pretence of concealment as to the meaning of that measure. It is the first step in the reorganisation of the British Empire on the basis of centralisation of authority at Westminster. For two generations, ever since Lord Durham's report following upon the rebellion of 1837, the tendency has been toward greater and greater powers of Colonial Self-Government. Now the Overseas Dominions, if the centralisers have their way, are to be degraded from the standing of self-governing nations within the Empire, and are to become "Provinces" of the Empire.

I cannot believe that any intelligent Canadian can read such stuff without a smile of good-natured contempt. Such far-fetched arguments merely prove the existence in the Liberal ranks of a small number of Separatists who bitterly resent the defeat of the attempt to make Canada an adjunct of the American Republic, and would do anything or say anything to strain the relations between this country and Great Britain. They are responsible for the obstruction which, if it be not promptly checked, will destroy the reputation which the Canadian House of Commons enjoyed of being the most businesslike and cool-headed assembly in the world. All this wild work is merely a result of the fact that the Liberal "machine" is not yet aware that it has been scrapped. If an appeal to the electorate were forced on a direct Imperial issue (the Reciprocity controversy was only an indirect issue), there would not be forty Liberals in the new House. But Mr. Borden, who has handled the crisis with coolness and a fine dignity, is prepared to put his measure through, and it will not be long before Canada has her three warships. After all, they will be Canada's property, to lend or withhold as she chooses.

E. B. O.

INDIA

THE WORK OF LORD SYDENHAM

In the first week of April, Lord Sydenham, who is more familiar to the British public as Sir George Clarke, will hand over the care of the city and Presidency of Bombay to Lord Willingdon, and will leave India for ever. The work of the Governor of an Indian Presidency does not usually receive much attention at home. The people of Great Britain, when they think at all about those who are ruling India, think of the Viceroy, and in his effulgence lesser stars are paled. Yet the Governors of Presidencies have duties to perform which in some respects are scarcely less important than those of the head of the Government of India. Just now, for example, no one in India, not even the Viceroy himself, is doing work more difficult or more delicate than that which Lord Carmichael is tackling with marked success in Bengal. Four years ago the man who for a space bore the brunt of the very awkward task of tiding India through a dangerous crisis was Lord Sydenham. At that time the Bombay Presidency was the real centre of most of the unrest which was disturbing the country. In Bengal and the Punjab the flames leaped forth and were visible. In Bombay the fires only seemed to smoulder, but they went far deeper. It was due to the quiet strength and unceasing vigilance of Lord Sydenham that they were eventually damped down. That was the greatest service Lord Sydenham rendered during his term of office, and it was not less valuable because it was mostly unseen. The essence of his work at that juncture was, in fact, that it should not be seen. The multitude heard little about it, except at the time of the dramatic arrest and conviction of Mr. Tilak. Few echoes regarding it ever reached England. Lord Sydenham held Western India in a grip of iron which never relaxed until the danger of trouble was over, and he did it in absolute silence. Those concerned quickly realised the manner of man with whom they had to deal, but they said nothing and he said nothing. Yet the grip was felt everywhere, and its purpose was attained. The proudest feature of his achievement—and, in a sense, its most

reassuring feature—was that he never lost the esteem of the Indian peoples committed to his especial charge.

Lord Sydenham's work in Western India is worthy of more than passing notice, because in many ways he has been an exceptional Governor of Bombay. It is worth attention, too, because it illustrates aptly the great opportunities which still lie before a Presidency Governor even in these days of comparative centralisation. The delusion has prevailed too long in England that a Governor in India is a mere ornament, with "a bodyguard and a band," to quote a certain memorable despatch. The Presidency Governors are valuable factors in the system of British rule in India. A few years ago there was some reason to fear that they might be abolished altogether. The creation of a Presidency Governorship in Bengal has, however, given a new lease of life to the Governors. By a fortunate coincidence, Lord Sydenham has simultaneously demonstrated their worth during a tenure of office which has been of the utmost benefit to the Bombay Presidency. Western India has had many capable rulers, but it is no disparagement of Lord Sydenham's eminent predecessors to record the general verdict that he is the ablest Governor Bombay has had for a very long period.

Yet he has never courted popularity, for that is not his nature. Every wise pro-consul soon realises that to court popularity in India is a grave mistake. Lord Sydenham could never have done so, for his reserved though courteous disposition is utterly at variance with the arts of the market-place. There have been times when his habit of self-reliance has led to the accusation of undue aloofness, which is perhaps not wholly unfounded. He has never been an instrument in the hands of his permanent officials, and has occasionally been too ready to rely on his own uninfluenced judgment. He has made mistakes, as no Governor with energy could fail to do. His racing legislation was one such error. It was not the legislation, but the manner in which he originally sought to carry it, which aroused widespread resentment. "He is an admirable Governor, but very often he does the right thing in the wrong way," was the bitter comment of one indignant critic during that particular controversy. Remarks of the kind have often been heard in Bombay during the last five years. Lord Sydenham has frequently been at cross

purposes with the European community, which is a fault every Governor should seek to avoid, because he is more dependent than may be thought upon European support. He was not very popular with the services, who complained that his methods were occasionally arbitrary, though on the other hand there are many good men who owe substantial advancement to his discernment of their qualities, and are duly grateful. The Indian communities came to believe in him profoundly, and with good reason, for they found him upright, thoroughly sincere, intensely eager for their well-being, and no flatterer. The great influence he attained among Indians is the best tribute to his worth. It would be a disservice to represent him as free from faults. His faults have been conspicuous, and they have sometimes involved him in difficulties. He has occasionally been wrong in his judgments both of men and of issues, but who has not? Let us pass to the more agreeable task of recording the good things he has done. That, after all, is the spirit in which we should approach the achievements of a ruler of India when he is unbuckling his armour. All India will always be found over-ready to tell us where he has gone astray. The mistakes of a Viceroy or a Governor, the defects of his temperament, the acts due to hastiness or impatience, find a thousand busy narrators. His own countrymen should rather say: "Let us hear the best and not the worst about him"; and in the case of Lord Sydenham let it always be remembered, with deep and respectful sympathy, that much of his work was done under a load of domestic sorrow and bereavement which would have utterly broken a weaker man.

Lord Sydenham's greatest constructive work has been associated with education. His term of office has been memorable for very long advances in the educational system of Western India. When he arrived in India, the provisions of the Universities Act passed by Lord Curzon were being slowly put into operation. The situation in Bombay was full of difficulty, for the principal opposition to the Act had been offered by certain members of the Senate of the Bombay University. Lord Sydenham had to deal with a reformed Senate, greatly reduced in numbers, but the factious spirit in which Lord Curzon had been fought was still very rife. All through the year 1908 the new Governor

devoted much time to studying the Indian University system, and the curriculum prescribed in the Bombay Presidency. At the end of the year his conclusions were embodied in a letter to the Registrar of the University, which was understood to have been drafted by his own hand. He urged that "intellectual training, rather than the accumulation of ill-digested knowledge," must become the primary aim of the University. To that end he submitted a programme of reforms, which included revolutionary changes in the curriculum. His proposals raised a storm of protest, and he soon found himself involved in a long and sometimes acrimonious controversy with a powerful section of the Senate. He won in the end, as he has generally won, by quiet and dogged persistence. Many of the reforms he recommended have now been carried into effect, and are seen to be good. The curriculum has been largely transformed, and higher education in Western India to-day approximates far more nearly to his ideals of well-ordered courses, a rational continuity of study, and thoroughness. Last year, in his capacity as Chancellor of the University, he advised upon the allocation of the liberal special grants made by the Government of India. He recommended the engagement of brilliant scholars from Great Britain, to give courses of lectures at Bombay and Poona, with the object of raising the general tone of University teaching; the establishment of chairs for post-graduate teaching in special subjects; the development of the University library; and the appointment of an expert from the English Board of Education for two years, to examine into the working of higher education in all its branches, and to bring the University into line with present requirements. These recommendations have been to a great extent adopted.

In the first of his admirable Convocation addresses, Lord Sydenham drew attention to the defective scientific training then obtaining in India. He pointed out that in the preceding five years only twenty-five degrees of Bachelor of Science had been conferred as compared with 1321 Bachelorships of Arts. On this and later occasions, he pleaded earnestly for an endownment of science teaching. The results were striking. Eminent citizens of the Presidency gave handsome donations towards the scheme eventually devised by the Governor. Lord

Sydenham found himself in possession of a sum of nearly £200,000, of which about £40,000 was given by the Bombay Government and the University. Ample funds are therefore available for the construction of buildings, for an endowment, and for founding some scholarships. The Science Institute of Bombay is already in course of erection, and the King-Emperor has been pleased to signify that its name may bear the prefix "Royal." Lord Sydenham, whose previous great experience in the work of scientific education stood him in good stead in Bombay, has even laid down the general lines which the Institute courses are to follow. The example thus set stimulated the thriving city of Ahmedabad to emulation, and now Ahmedabad has a Science Institute also, which it owes to the public spirit of one of its inhabitants.

These activities only represent a tithe of Lord Sydenham's educational work. He strongly espoused the cause of primary education, though he was rightly opposed to compulsion, as unsuited to the special needs of India. In three years his Government opened over a thousand new primary schools, though the total for the last five and a half years is considerably more. The wretched pay of teachers in primary schools was increased, and Lord Sydenham personally overhauled the curriculum. The system of secondary education was improved, and the standard was raised by increasing the fees, an unpopular but necessary step. Technical education was investigated, and measures for its development are now in progress. Lord Sydenham raised funds for the establishment of a College of Commerce, which is about to be started under two Professors selected in England. So deep is the interest which the retiring Governor has taken in the College of Commerce, that the fund now being raised for a memorial of his rule will probably be applied to the institution's endowment, and it is suggested that it should bear his name. He was not unmindful of the grave danger visible in India owing to the divorce of intellectual from moral instruction. In 1910 he summoned a conference of teachers to consider the question of moral education, at which he deplored "the weakening of parental influence, the loss of reverence for authority, the decadence of manners and the growing moral laxity." He urged that the restraining forces

of ancient India had lost some of their power, while the restraining forces of the West were inoperative in India. The conference was of much value in calling attention to a problem of vital importance. Its results are seen in the handbook of moral instruction afterwards placed in the hands of teachers, and in the good work now being done in Western India by Mr. Gould, of the Moral Education League. The importation of able men from England has, by the way, always been a definite part of Lord Sydenham's educational policy. The course of lectures on commerce and economics by Professor Lees-Smith made a great impression; but when all is said, the marked educational revival now visible in the Bombay Presidency is due more than anything else to the innumerable earnest addresses delivered on the subject by Lord Sydenham himself. An invitation to visit a school and say some words of encouragement always seemed to exercise upon him the same fascination which most Governors experience when an attentive forest officer enticingly begs "His Excellency" to come and shoot a tiger.

In the domain of general executive administration, he has done much to help forward the development of agriculture. He shrewdly refrained from meddling with the Bombay revenue system, which has far fewer defects than it had twenty years ago. Instead, he sought to induce the cultivators to adopt better methods, a task which is not so hopeless as some agricultural experts who have visited India would have us believe. Under his control the Agricultural Colleges made steady progress, and his personal interest in the periodical Agricultural Conferences caused them to be attended by Indians from all parts of the Presidency. His zeal for the development of co-operative credit societies had excellent results. The rural societies in Bombay are not yet so numerous as in the United Provinces and the Punjab, but the movement is growing wider in scope, and it has been greatly assisted by the Co-operative Conferences which Lord Sydenham inaugurated. The enthusiasm shown at these gatherings fills with astonishment those who can recall the apathy which attended the inception of the co-operative credit system in Western India. In the Forest Department, Lord Sydenham introduced changes which were greatly needed. Long ago I was struck by the extraordinary character of the

alleged "forest reserves" in the Deccan. It was an anomaly at which I have often tilted, but in vain. In the early days of Government forestry in India, an enthusiastic officer—who nevertheless did good work—had contrived to mark down as "forest reserves" large areas in the Deccan which were almost as destitute of trees as Arabia Petrœa. Lord Sydenham's attention was called to the question by the abnormal number of petty "forest offences" recorded in the Deccan. He appointed a committee to enquire into the matter, and summoned to its aid Mr. Hugh Murray, an able and sympathetic forest officer with much practical experience. The result of the investigation was that a large extent of land was set free for cultivation, and "forest offences" in the Deccan rapidly diminished. This was by no means a minor reform; it was a wise decision which materially affected the peasantry; but it is only mentioned here as an illustration, for it was one of many such beneficent acts accomplished by Lord Sydenham which are hidden in the dry records of Indian revenue work.

Another such act was his abolition of the harassing road tolls, a change which has still to be completed, for I was more than once held up for road tolls in the Bombay Presidency a year ago. To the motorist road tolls are merely an irritation, but to the impecunious ryot with his bullock-cart they represent a real hardship. Sometimes the ryot would make long circuitous journeys across country to avoid a toll, and men have often been known to leave articles of clothing in pledge with the toll contractor when they had no money to pay. Thanks to Lord Sydenham, road tolls will soon have disappeared altogether. Again, he paid strenuous attention to the condition of the police, about which so many complaints have been made. The committee he appointed discovered many defects, and the whole force has now been reorganised upon a more efficient basis. The recurrence of famine in Gujerat led him to consider whether the charitable relief funds raised at such times could be better distributed. As a result of his initiative, a permanent Famine Relief Fund is being built up for the Presidency, and it is hoped that there will be a permanent body to administer it. Permanent stores of fodder for cattle will probably be one salutary outcome of this scheme.

I fear that this record of Lord Sydenham's work is degenerating into a mere catalogue, but if that is the case, it is due to the remarkable diversity and multiplicity of his labours. One can only select and briefly note. The health of the people was a subject which engaged his constant solicitude. Soon after he landed he started the Bombay Medical Congress, a gathering which attracted delegates from Japan and America, while the record of its proceedings has circulated in many lands. He renewed the efforts which many had made before him to popularise protective inoculation against plague, and if the resultant statistics were not striking, at least there was much lessening of prejudice against the process. He carried a Medical Registration Act in the face of strong opposition, and was instrumental in founding a Medical Council, thus being the author of the first real steps to check the irregular and uninstructed practice of medicine and surgery in India. Hospitals all over the Presidency had the benefit of his personal interest and practical help.

He has left his mark deeply upon the capital of his province, and if all his schemes are carried to completion—which is still a matter of doubt—no one will have done more for the vast city of Bombay since the days of Bartle Frere. He laid down a broad and statesmanlike policy for the development and improvement of the city. The great North to South Avenue is about to be undertaken as the result of his efforts. He obtained a grant of £333,000 for the empty coffers of the Improvement Trust, and by an Act passed last year settled a long and bitter dispute between the Trust and the Municipal Corporation about the ultimate disposal of the Trust's property. He has set in motion a scheme for an immense reclamation of the foreshores at the southern end of the island, demonstrated its financial and technical practicability, and has now submitted it to the Government of India for sanction. If it is approved, it will transform the narrow southern end of the island into a spacious area of parks and building sites. He has introduced a Town-Planning Bill for the adjacent extensive island of Salsette, and has made building sites at Bombay's beautiful hill station of Matheran available for people of limited means. He has carried a scheme for building a noble structure upon the Apollo Bunder, "the Gateway of India," though in this instance the suggestion came from the

King-Emperor himself. He has insisted upon the electrification of the disfiguring railway along Queen's Road, on the shores of Back Bay, and has facilitated the preparation of a large scheme by which all the railways entering Bombay will ultimately be electrified. It was through his ardent intervention and help that Sir Dorab Tata was able to inaugurate his huge hydro-electric power scheme, by which all the great mills of Bombay —and possibly the railways also—will be driven by power derived from huge lakes formed in the Western Ghauts by the storage of the monsoonal rains.

These are but a tithe of Lord Sydenham's varied and sucessful labours in India, told for the most part barely and without comment. They crown the life's work of a soldier, a scholar, and an administrator who has fought in Egypt and the Soudan, governed a great state in Australia, attained lasting fame as one of the greatest living authorities on land defence, made invaluable contributions to the science of gunnery, and rendered great though unrequited service in the reorganisation of the War Office and in the work of Imperial Defence. His record in Bombay is only one of the later phases of an arduous and vivid life. It silences criticism and compels admiration.

ASIATICUS.

THE
NATIONAL REVIEW

No. 363. MAY 1913

EPISODES OF THE MONTH

Thanks to the Cranks

THE Balkan War has produced several crises, at each of which the relations between the Great Powers appear to have reached the breaking-point. As in every case the difficulty has been successfully tided over by the general reluctance of Europe to plunge into the unknown at this particular moment, onlookers have become almost cynical in their optimism. They are convinced that somehow or other, however black may be the outlook, we shall muddle through. Of the rôle played by Great Britain during the last six months we know comparatively little, indeed perhaps less than of the rôle played by any other Power. On the whole there is no disposition to quarrel with Sir Edward Grey, who, thanks to the attacks of the cranks in his own camp, has enjoyed a larger immunity from criticism than any British Foreign Minister of our time. On the contrary, there is a widespread desire to believe that he has made the best of that difficult job known as making bricks without straw. The campaign of the German Press throughout the earlier years of his administration eased his position here, if it did not establish his reputation with his own countrymen, supported as it was by the vendetta of our pro-Germans. It was naturally felt among the general public that any Englishman enjoying the animosity of a hostile Power must at least be trying to do his duty, the culminating-point being attained when the German Press informed its cocoa

colleagues in this country that they should adopt as their battle-cry G.M.G., which was supposed to signify "Grey Must Go." Were Sir Edward Grey a Bismarck or given to Bismarckian methods one might have suspected that he or some Busch on his behalf had inspired this brilliant effort of domestic and foreign enemies, of which the single effect must necessarily be to stop any incipient criticism of the "man under fire." Latterly some anxiety has been caused among the steadfast supporters of the Grey policy, not only by his evident inability to realise that every serious policy requires serious weapons—he acquiesced in the Fisher fraud and in the Haldane fraud, and to-day he tolerates the Seely fraud and the Churchill fraud—but on account of the changed attitude of the German Press towards him.

Suspicious Praise

THE *Westminster Gazette*, which has naturally been regarded with suspicion on the Anglo-German question since it fell under the controlling influence of Sir Alfred Moritz Mond, the passionate advocate of Free Trade for other people, has triumphantly reproduced a long article in praise of the British Foreign Minister from the columns of the *Daily Telegraph* of Berlin—their *Berliner Tageblatt*—pointing out how successfully Sir Edward Grey has scored throughout the Balkan crisis and how "poor dear Germany" has been compelled to take a back seat. The case is set out with some circumstance, the average German being made to feel what a worm he is through the clumsiness and incompetence of the conductors of German policy, while the odious British are happy in possessing a great and far-seeing Foreign Minister able to take occasion by the hand and exploit every crisis for the advantage of Great Britain. Sir Edward Grey is put on a pinnacle by our Berlin contemporary, whence he loftily directs the puny Powers feebly struggling in the valley of indecision below. Such a tribute from such a quarter is calculated to flatter British vanity, and the *Westminster Gazette* cannot conceal its glee, but most people instinctively felt "an enemy hath done this thing." The object of the article is obvious, namely to flatter Sir Edward Grey—we believe him to be entirely free from vanity—while showing the French and Russians what "small beer" they are compared to the mighty non-military Power off the coast of the Continent who, by superior skill and cunning, is

able to reap the harvest sown by others. Sir Edward Grey's reputation rests on his undeviating loyalty to international engagements, written and moral, and we decline to believe that he will allow himself to be cajoled by the organs of the Wilhelmstrasse any more than he allowed himself to be coerced into resuming the rôle of Perfide Albion which is nowadays allotted to us in every German version of the European caste. However, it behoves Englishmen to remain on the *qui vive* and to watch international developments more keenly than ever, while declining to attach exaggerated importance to carefully concocted articles primarily intended for export and designed to arouse distrust of the British Foreign Minister among statesmen and Powers with whom Great Britain seeks the closest co-operation.

Cross Currents

GERMANY usually knows her own mind, but at this moment various cross-currents hamper that clear-thinking which is a characteristic of her policy, which beyond a chronic desire to fish in troubled waters is momentarily somewhat indefinite, though it must never be forgotten by those who would be on their guard against surprise that German armaments place the German Empire in a position to give a disagreeable turn to the situation at any moment. All she has to do is to egg on Austria-Hungary, who admittedly occupies a peculiarly difficult position, thanks to the general if not universal miscalculation last year as to the possibility of a Balkan war and as to its probable course in the unlikely event of hostilities. We shall to-day hopelessly misjudge every phase of the Near Eastern question unless we continually bear in mind that the leading Governments of Europe were convinced even after they became aware of the formation of the Balkan League that they could stop any war that threatened. Similarly the "best informed" General Staffs of the Great Powers, who were less sanguine than statesmen and diplomatists as to the preservation of peace, believed that in the event of war the Peasant States might conceivably secure some preliminary successes, but that when once the full military power of Turkey was developed Greeks, Servians, and Montenegrins, would vanish like chaff before the wind, and that though there might be a sharp tussle with Bulgaria the issue would be ultimately decided by the superior numbers at the disposal of the Porte. Intervention

alone could save the little Balkan nations from annihilation. Even the date at which Sofia would be occupied by the Turks was anticipated by distinguished soldiers. At the same time it was recognised that intervention was practically impossible without a war among the interveners.

Miscalculations

EUROPEAN statesmanship was taken completely by surprise at its own dismal failure to preserve peace last autumn, which was seriously believed to depend on the form of joint simultaneous or identic Notes so dear to literary men of affairs, while the soldiers were equally amazed at the miscarriage of their forecasts as to the probable issue of the war. The remarkable concert between the allies and the brilliant strategy of the Bulgarians, combined with the woeful unpreparedness of the Turkish territorials and the conspicuous absence of strategic and tactical intelligence, temporarily preserved the peace of Europe by robbing would-be interveners of the ghost of an opportunity, though gradually it was realised throughout the Chanceries that the very Balance of Power itself was among the issues involved in this titanic struggle of the little peoples. It would however be wise to await the conclusion of an unfinished episode before the *quidnuncs* throw up their hats. The prolonged pause and futile negotiations in London were undoubtedly inspired in the interests of Turkey, as it was confidently calculated that the allies had, in vulgar parlance, had such "a bellyful of fighting" that even Bulgarian ardour would cool down and that General Savoff would not be able to get his men to face the music again, while the Ottoman Empire would automatically grow stronger and numbers would at last come into their own. However, the London negotiations were abortive, owing to the misjudgment of the Turks and their friends as to what the former could do and the superior statesmanship of the Balkan League, which realised that their fighting capacity was still unexhausted. War was accordingly resumed, and after what was deemed an unconscionable delay by the newspapers, whose correspondents were neither allowed to direct nor to boom the belligerents, a further series of victories was achieved by the despised allies, pronounced by experts to be at the end of their tether. Janina was captured by the Greeks, Djavid Pasha on the banks of the

Skumbi surrendered to the Servians, Adrianople was triumphantly carried by the irresistible Bulgarians, though not without serious sacrifices. It was very disconcerting to diplomacy, which had intended to settle every outlying problem without further fighting, and the prospect of *les grandes impuissances* asserting themselves became fine by degrees and beautifully less. The benighted little nations, which had put their fortunes to the touch in the supreme ordeal, seemed determined to settle the whole question according to their own interests, without considering the susceptibilities of the great lookers-on. But so long as there is life there is hope, and as Skutari remained in Turkish hands the Chanceries felt that life was still worth living. Something might be pulled out of the fire and placed to the credit side of a somewhat disastrous account. After prolonged *pourparlers*, the so-called concert of Europe found a formula in "the coercion of Montenegro," which would have been purely comic but for the issues involved and the formidable forces in the background. We are not criticising the diplomats whom circumstances had placed in a highly ridiculous position. Theirs was a hard lot, thanks to thirty years muddling of the Eastern question, and it is devoutly to be hoped that, though they bear great responsibility for the smaller war, they may succeed in avoiding the greater Armageddon.

Conflict of Interests

THE difficulty as usual lay in getting Austria-Hungary and Russia into line, not owing to any extra dose of original sin in either of those Powers, but simply because in both cases real vital national interests are involved of which their Governments are fully conscious. With them it is not a case of directing other people in the way they should go, by articles and speeches from a comfortable distance, which appears to be our happy lot. Austria-Hungary's long-cherished ambition of developing eastwards would appear to have received a severe check from the unforeseen military power of the Southern Slavs, who not only may become strong enough to block her permanently from coveted outlets, but likewise act with magnetic power upon Slavs within the Austro-Hungarian Dominions, who are by no means contented with their present lot. On the other hand, to Russia, as the mother Slav Power, any coercion of a minor Slav nation,

especially Montenegro, once described by a Tsar at a critical moment as "Russia's only friend," was so repulsive as to provoke a movement of Russian public opinion such as swept the St. Petersburg Government into war with Turkey thirty-six years ago. However, after unheard-of efforts, in which it must be said that the spirit of moderation dominated Vienna and St. Petersburg, it was finally agreed and decreed by the Great Powers, who have kept in close touch through the London Conference of Ambassadors, that in any event Skutari should be incorporated in the new Albania, whose autonomy is prized by Austria, as some set-off to the great territorial expansion of Slavdom elsewhere. Montenegro was advised, and indeed commanded, to abandon the prolonged siege of Skutari, but, as might have been expected, the concert of Europe was somewhat half-hearted owing to conflicting sentiments. Russia contented herself with "acquiescing" in the coercion of Montenegro. It was all she could be reasonably asked for. There was no enthusiasm in France for a job distasteful to an ally who had lately furnished further and precious proofs of her attachment to the Republic. Italy derived a minimum of satisfaction from making herself disagreeable to the family of her beloved Queen. Germany, having expressed approval of the policy through deference to the wishes of her Austrian ally, indulged in the usual sneers when it came to carrying it out, being divided between a desire to run with the hare and hold with the hounds. Great Britain reluctantly assented, after being convinced that the peace of Europe was trembling in the balance, as is evident from Sir Edward Grey's explanation of a distasteful policy in the House of Commons. Austria-Hungary alone was enthusiastic. She had made so many sacrifices of *amour propre* and treasure during the past winter and could not forgo a last opportunity of showing that she was more Teuton than Slav.

"Graceful Concessions"

ONLY one thing was needed to secure the triumph of the concert of Europe and to convince a sceptical world that it was still "in being," namely the submission of Montenegro and the abandonment of the siege of Skutari. But the single effect of European diplomacy was, so to speak, to "binge up" the mountaineers, while King Nicholas hurled defiance at the embattled hosts of the Continent—he

probably had no alternative, as he would have lost his throne by obedience—while the attack on this last Turkish stronghold was renewed with redoubled vigour. In the beginning of April some outworks were carried. The Powers replied by proclaiming a blockade of the coast from Antivari to the River Drin, the command of the International Squadron told off for the duty of bringing Montenegro to reason being gracefully conceded to this country in the person of Vice-Admiral Burney, probably in order to arouse the suspicions of Slavs and Italians, to whom this action was equally odious, though, for various reasons, both found themselves constrained to assent to it. There were the usual pæans of joy over such a practical demonstration of the solidarity of Europe in the face of "a common danger," while our Potsdam Press emphasised the fact that the German lamb and the British lion were lying down side by side, under a British Admiral. Enthusiasts inferred that all would be well for all time. Germany would realise the futility of having a fleet of her own, seeing that our ships were quite capable of doing the needful, while the British Fleet could be correspondingly reduced and the money saved spent on catching votes. It was a brilliant, if brief, moment in the chequered chapter of Anglo-German relations. Europe, as usual, reckoned without her host. Turkey, it is true, was believed to be ready to place her disordered affairs in the hands of the Great Powers, for the simple reason that no other course was open to her. Bulgaria, Servia, and Greece were expected to paralyse one another owing to the revival of internecine feuds, which must inevitably break out when the restraining influence of war had been removed, as they hated one another more than they hated the Turk, and the divsion of the spoils would destroy the Balkan League and place its component parts at the mercy of Roumania, who, though remaining out of the picture, has never been out of the reckoning of serious students of the Near Eastern embroglio.

Fall of Skutari

THE situation dragged for a fortnight, during which the International Squadron did nothing in particular, but did it very well, when all of a sudden came the startling news that the unexpected had once more happened, and that Skutari, which had successfully defied its assailants for six months, was actually in the hands of the

Montenegrins (April 23). Politics apart it is impossible to withhold admiration from the great feat achieved by the littlest of the little peoples in securing their hearts' desire, upon the achievement of which, from the opening of the war, the entire resources of the manhood of Montenegro, and the womanhood too, had been concentrated. Nor must we forget to render justice to the defenders for their gallant and steadfast resistance, which, together with the defence of Adrianople, have done something to redeem the military reputation of Turkey, which has suffered cruelly owing to the maladministration of the old Turks and the appalling inexperience and ineptitude of the young Turks. At the outbreak of the war Hassan Riza Pasha, an officer of real distinction, was Vali of Skutari and Commander of the Skutari Division of the Ottoman Army. He had been a member of the Committee in the early days of the revolution and followed Mahommed Shevket Pasha in his march from Salonika to Constantinople, but he gave up politics and strongly encouraged other soldiers to do the same. Prior to the siege, the Skutari garrison was reinforced by the arrival of Essad Pasha Toptan at the head of a division of Albanian Redifs, which gave the General in Command considerable strength. On the announcement of the decision of the Powers to incorporate Skutari in an independent autonomous Albania, Essad Pasha Toptan hoisted the Albanian flag, on the ground that it was only when fighting under the national banner that the Albanian troops could be relied upon to oppose the Montenegrins. The relations between the two Generals became rather strained, and Hassan Riza, who was an intimate friend of Nazim Pasha, was murdered shortly after the news of the War Minister's death reached Skutari in February on his way from dining with the Albanian General, who is alleged to have offered him his own A.D.C. as escort on Hassan Riza's return home, but the latter refused. After this tragedy Essad Pasha Toptan became Commander of Skutari. He is a great and powerful Albanian Chief of the old Highland type, rapacious, brave, resourceful, "bloody, bold, and dangerous." Under the Albanian flag Skutari put up a fine defence, which it was believed the besiegers would be unable to overcome. However the coercion of the concert, as we have seen, had an extraordinarily

stimulating influence on the Montenegrins, who realised that it was a case of now or never, and after making great sacrifices, when the garrison were short of food-supplies and ammunition, the place was carried by storm, King Nicholas, with sagacious magnanimity, allowing the defenders to march out with the honours of war, taking some of their guns with them.

Agitation Abroad

It is too soon to appreciate the effect of this further memorable episode in a wonderful war upon the European situation. Needless to say, the capture of Skutari caused the utmost satisfaction to the other Balkan States, while the Russian people make no pretence of concealing their joy, though the Russian Government is fully conscious of the introduction of another disturbing element in her delicate relations with Austria-Hungary. The reception of the news in other capitals necessarily varied. Official Turkey professes equanimity, on the comfortable theory that the fate of Skutari now concerns Europe rather than Constantinople. Berlin declared that nothing could affect the unanimous determination of the Powers as expressed by the joint *démarche* at Cettigne and the *communiqué* of the Russian Government and the common naval demonstration, that Skutari should belong to Albania. Paris became more than ever conscious of the delicacy of the position, as were France to participate in the naval demonstration it was as nothing compared to the opposition which would be aroused to actual measures of coercion against King Nicholas. We imagine that this is very much the view entertained in England, where the demonstration against Montenegro has never been popular and was only undertaken lest worse evils should ensue. The British are immensely influenced by the *fait accompli* and the logic of the stricken field is difficult to overcome. We are convinced that for us the only policy is to walk hand in hand with France and Russia, who are no less anxious than we are to keep the peace of Europe, which depends more upon the solidarity of the Triple Entente than upon anything else. Sir Edward Grey would make a fatal blunder if he allowed himself to be coaxed into occupying the position of a detached skirmisher between the Triple Alliance and the Dual Alliance. The only result of such an attitude on

our part would deservedly be to arouse the suspicion of every other Power on a question on which our interests are manifestly secondary, while nothing could be more calculated to endanger the general peace than to give our enemies a pretext for declaring that England the unreliable is at her old game of Perfide Albion.

Irritation in Vienna

Let us frankly recognise that every alternative presents difficulties. The best hope lies in the moderation of the Russian Government, which has so far succeeded in holding its own against its Chauvinists, and even amidst the natural exultation caused by the Montenegrin triumph it is announced that Russia will not allow herself to be deflected from the common policy of which the constitution of an independent Albania forms an integral part. The various currents of opinion among diplomatists indicate that, while pessimists aver that the situation has abruptly changed for the worse because the Montenegrins will not relinquish Skutari unless expelled by force, optimists assert that King Nicholas' position is so greatly strengthened among his own people by his glorious coup that his prestige will enable him to abandon Skutari on reasonable terms. Others again affirm, that for all practical purposes the position remains unchanged because the agreement of the Powers is unbroken. Let us hope they may be right, though they are somewhat hazy as regards the practical problem, namely the means by which the Montenegrins are to be persuaded to relinquish the object of their ambition, or, alternatively, how they are to be expelled. Russia cannot undertake this disagreeable task; France is as little likely to attempt it, while few Englishmen believe that our exiguous expeditionary force will invest Cettigne. Much will depend on the attitude of Austria-Hungary and the advice of Germany. The capture of Skutari caused as much disgust in Vienna as delight in St. Petersburg. According to the well-informed *Times* Vienna correspondent, "the official standpoint, proclaimed with emphasis in all directions, is that the fall of Skutari changes nothing in the question of its destiny. The decision of the Powers that Skutari shall be Albanian must be executed with or without the co-operation of Europe. Should the other Powers hesitate Austria-Hungary will act alone."

One must however remember that the Dual Monarchy is a divided House. Recent events show that it is extremely difficult for the Austro-Hungarian Government to adopt an anti-Slav policy, and over and over again impatient demands for prompt action have been followed by procrastination and inaction, which have saved the situation. The strength of Slav feeling which, for military reasons alone, the Vienna Government is compelled to consider, may best be indicated by a notable article in the official organ of the Absolutist Croatian Government (*see Times*, April 22), the *Narodni Novini* of Agram: "We rejoice with our whole heart at this success, which proves again that our Montenegrin brethren still possess the heroic qualities of their glorious ancestors. The courage and self-sacrifice of the Montenegrin soldiers assures them the recognition of Europe, and adds a fresh leaf of laurel to their crown of fame." The reader will be able to form a more useful opinion of the international effect of the fall of Skutari than we can hope to do at the moment of going to press. If delay can be secured until the present excitement subsides we may still hope that the little war will end without precipitating the bigger war which has haunted the Chanceries of Europe throughout the winter and spring, and for which provident Powers have made preparation, though Great Britain unfortunately is not among their number, our politicians being content with the utterances of an Asquith, who has at any time during the last few months been prepared to tell us that in his opinion "rather sooner than later," an honourable and peaceful settlement will be reached. Any one who says sufficiently often that peace will come is bound one day or another to take his place among the prophets. No less may be said of a perpetual prophet of war.

Safety in Delay

"PLUS c'a change plus c'est la meme chose." We are unable to share the sensation caused by recent Krupp revelations. As regards the alleged charges of corruption it is wiser to be silent. People who live in Limehouses shouldn't throw stones. The public service of Germany, though not overpaid, is, on the whole, clean, wholesome, and devoted to the interests of the State. Would that all countries could say the same. Official misdeeds will be promptly dealt

Krupp

with by the German Emperor and the German Government without the intervention of Select Committees and without sacrificing national interests to party considerations. On such matters Germany seeks and needs no advice from this side of the water. We can, however, sympathise with the interest aroused in the Fatherland where Krupp and the Kaiser divide the allegiance of patriots. Indeed, it has long been regarded (and the attitude of successive Kaisers has done not a little to encourage it) as almost *lèse majesté* to criticise Krupp, which from the days of Bismarck has stood before the world as one of the pillars of German greatness. This unpleasant subject was brought before the Reichstag on April 19 by the Socialist Deputy, Dr. Liebknecht, who is, we believe, member for Potsdam, and naturally when he opened fire upon Krupp it was generally anticipated that he would be annihilated by the War Minister in the usual flamboyant fashion for attacking the Army and Navy, as both are equally dependent on Krupp, and held up to public execration as a typical Socialistic *sans patrie* who was betraying his country to the enemy at a crisis of her fate. But this was not to be. Matters had gone too far, for not only did the member for Potsdam give a detailed account of the corrupt operations of certain armament firms working in sinister conjunction with War Office officials, but he named the firm, the newspapers inspired by them, saying *inter alia* that until a few weeks ago the House of Krupp maintained an agent in Berlin whose business it was to bribe officials in the Admiralty and the War Office in order to obtain secret documents and thus get ahead of other firms outside this inner ring or *Marine Verstandigung*, whose members exchanged information and divided up the profits on the contracts obtained by any of them for parts of ships. Dr. Liebknecht did not stop there, for he declared that as a result of information supplied by himself to the Ministry of War proceedings had already been taken against the persons implicated. General von Heeringen, the Minister of War, found himself in an awkward predicament when he rose to reply to this damaging because circumstantial indictment, and no doubt he would have preferred to dismiss the episode as a vile invention of Socialist enemies of German greatness. Unfortunately he could only accuse Dr. Liebknecht of exaggeration, complaining that he had

requested the postponement of the interpellation because the preliminary investigation was not finished.

The "Subordinate"

THE War Minister admitted that a subordinate official of the firm of Krupp had acquired documents from several corporals and non-commissioned officers, while a high official was involved, though he could not say whether the Directors of the Krupp firm were implicated, as that "was not yet certain." (Socialist cries of "It is always a subordinate.") Dr. Liebknecht had mentioned the name of Herr von Dewitz, who, he said, was a highly-placed official in Krupp's works at Essen, as the recipient and custodian of the reports from their Berlin agent. The War Minister insisted that in any case there was no question of a betrayal of military secrets imperilling the Fatherland, and he wound up with a peroration on the national debt to Krupp, the creator of German artillery. "This must be recognised with gratitude irrespectively of the present case." The attitude of the War Minister was neither confident nor encouraging and naturally made a much greater impression on the German public, which is immensely affected by official opinion, than the exposure of the Socialists, whose business it is to expose the powers that be, among whom Krupp may be ranked. The firm issued a statement to the effect that the disclosures were the result of the denunciation by a dismissed servant, that their subordinate agent in Berlin accused of improper practices received no funds from the firm beyond his salary, and that Krupps were in a position to uphold the "absolute honourableness of the long-tried official," Herr von Dewitz, to which the Socialist paper the *Vorwärts* replied that Herr von Dewitz had been for some time under arrest and was only released on bail. Dr. Liebknecht followed up his first arraignment by another speech denying the statement of the War Minister that secrets had not been betrayed, declaring that Krupps had in their safes at Essen a large number of secret documents about all manner of things—referring partly to the competition of other firms, but also to new constructions which the military authorities and their competitors desired to introduce. Many of these papers had been seized and the speaker possessed copies of several of them. He reiterated his charge that Herr

von Dewitz was the keeper of the documents, and protested against the Minister of War's tribute to Krupp, for "when it was asked how much Germany owed to Krupp he would ask how much Krupps owed to the German people, and whether the hundreds of millions now possessed by this firm did not come out of the pockets of the poorest of the poor." He referred to a letter in which Frederick Krupp recommended his guns to Napoleon III in 1868 and to Napoleon's reply expressing a lively desire for the success and extension of an industry that was destined to render considerable service to humanity.

Influencing the Foreign Press

DR. LIEBKNECHT asserted that the legal enquiry was being diverted into proceedings against the individual suspected of supplying him with his information, which was an additional reason for bringing the subject before the Reichstag, and he concluded by demanding a general and exhaustive investigation, claiming *inter alia* to have proved that among the methods adopted to stimulate German armaments was the circulation by armament firms of false reports in the foreign Press in order to excite German opinion in the interests of fresh expenditure, and he gave an instance of an attempt being made to obtain the insertion "if possible in one of the most widely read French newspapers" of an announcement that the French authorities intended to accelerate rearmament with machine guns and to order double the number of guns originally intended. In another speech the Minister of War repeated that so far as he knew there was no question of treason or of the betrayal of military secrets perilous to the security of the Empire, though he refused to discuss the matter any further, admitting however that three years ago an armament firm, the *Waffen-und-Munitionsfabrik*, had promoted the insertion of an article in the French Press, but according to a declaration by the Directors this was "merely with the purpose of securing by means of the contradiction something definite to go upon regarding the intentions of the French military authorities." In any case no influence had been exercised upon the German Army authorities, and he would beg his hearers to await the results of the enquiry in the Krupp

case. As we have said, Germany is master in her own house, and is quite able to regulate her domestic concerns without outside advice, and we should not have referred to the matter were it not for the fact, which is as old as the hills, and was publicly proclaimed to the world on the issue of that remarkable book, Busch's *Life of Bismarck*, that it is a recognised German practice not only by armament firms, but by German statesmen, diplomatists, princes, and even Emperors, to exploit the foreign Press for German purposes. Bismarck invented the system and his successors have maintained it. It is notorious to every one who has taken the trouble to read Busch or to acquaint himself with what is going on in Germany, and at no time has this intriguing been more persistent than to-day, and in no Press in the world is the finger of Germany so clearly distinguishable as in our own. We have always termed this section of British newspapers—which are no credit to their profession, whatever may be their Party politics and some of them make a great profession of Party devotion, either Radical or Unionist—the Potsdam Press, because whether their editors are conscious of it or not and whatever may be the process of filtration the source of inspiration is Potsdam or Berlin. The German Foreign Office has a special Press bureau for the single purpose of directing the Press at home and abroad in the way it should go. The correspondents of several English newspapers in Berlin regularly repair to the Wilhelmstrasse, where information can be cheaply obtained and is readily given to all "tame" correspondents of any nationality, especially the English and the American, artlessness being the dominant characteristic of Anglo-Saxons. Such correspondents gradually and unconsciously fall into the habit of sending their newspapers whatever information they receive in the Press bureau, which is naturally calculated to promote German rather than British interests. The work of independent correspondents is made correspondingly difficult, and it requires a man of grit to withstand the atmosphere. Much of the news that finds its way from Berlin to New York would be laughable were it not lamentable.

At different periods every foreign Press has been under this spell, and when the Wilhelmstrasse was controlled by a great man like Bismarck, the entire foreign Press danced to his piping, though the wonderful apparatus he created for misleading the world for the glorification of Germany was naturally somewhat discredited when its author disclosed the working of the machinery to an astonished Europe. It must likewise be remembered if the German question is to be understood, and unless it be understood we have little chance of doing our duty by Europe or of keeping our place in Europe, that every Germany embassy has likewise its bureau, and though there is natural reluctance to criticise ambassadorial activities by the Press of the country to which the representative of a friendly Power is accredited, the intimacy in recent years between the Press bureau of the German Embassy in London and a section of English newspapers, which have been skilfully played upon as a piano is played upon by a pianist, has been a matter of common knowledge and comment. The game is so obvious that it should impose on no one, but there are none so blind as those who will not see, and some of our able editors deem it their duty at the present time to espouse the cause of Germany at the expense of their own country. In season and out of season these same organs inform us that peace is the greatest of British interests, and yet their pens are apparently at the disposal of the only Power who threatens the peace of Europe. What is Germany doing? What does she want? The answer to these questions should indicate our duty. She is obviously engaged in piling up armaments on a scale without parallel in the history of nations. We used to be told that it was impossible for any Power to maintain at once a first-class Army and a first-class Navy, and Lord Haldane, a professed authority upon Germany, pooh-poohed the expansion of the German navy on the very ground that the Germans were too sensible to commit the impossible folly of saddling themselves with a burden that had never been successfully borne. The policy of British Ministers assumed for many years the soundness of Lord Haldane's view, which was not confined to one Party, and the Unionists have something to answer for, if not so much as their opponents, in refusing to take the German

The Anglo-Saxon Simpleton

menace seriously when it could have been effectively and economically dealt with. Messrs. Asquith and Co. reduced our Regular Army and failed to maintain our sea-Power, until one fine day, when it was rather too late, we awoke to realise that not only was the German Army automatically increasing hand over fist, but that while we were knocking off "Dreadnoughts" as a symbol of international goodwill and as a good example to others Germany was laying down "Dreadnoughts" until in the heyday of the régime of "Sleep quietly in your beds" (Sir John Fisher) not only had we abandoned the two-power standard, but even the one-power standard, being content to lay down two "Dreadnoughts" to Germany's four.

The Crime of 1908

We have never recovered from that crime, which coincided with a general scaling down of the British Navy, a cheeseparing refusal to provide the things necessary to enable our Fleet to keep the sea, namely men, docks, guns, destroyers, reserves of all kind, and it is by no means certain that the crime of 1908 may not land us in catastrophe. Germany has taken full advantage of the lead she then got, while our Government has been content with a few pseudo-patriotic speeches to impose on one party coupled with sustained inaction to placate the other. What is Germany doing? She is cajoling us with soft words in order to arouse the suspicions of our friends, while she herself is adopting a policy of armaments, which is tantamount to a declaration of war—at her own time. Her ambitions are Napoleonic, and it must be recognised that her weapons are not disproportionate to her ambitions. In one year she adds to her Army twice the number of troops that the Haldane policy has robbed from our Regular Army in five years, and 50 per cent. to the immediate striking force of her fleet. The reply of our politicians is to denounce Lord Roberts for endeavouring to awaken his self-complacent countrymen to some sense of their position, peril, and obligations, while resolutely refusing to take adequate measures either on land, on sea, or in the air. What does Germany want? And when we say Germany we do not mean the German masses, who don't count, but will docilely follow where they are led, but the powers that

be in Prussianised Germany, who call the tune without paying the piper. They aspire to dominate Europe, like Napoleon before them, and their single hope of attaining their object lies in sowing distrust among the nations composing the Triple Entente, consisting of Great Britain, Russia, and France. Cajolery, as we have seen, is applied in one quarter, coercion in another. For the time being at any rate Russia and France appreciate their risks and responsibilities and are taking time by the forelock, performing not only their own duties, but also our duties, in the hope that England the unready and the laggard may yet wake up in time to play her part in preserving that peace which, though the greatest of British interests, arouses so little genuine enthusiasm among us as to make it difficult to persuade our people and impossible to persuade our politicians to take the vital elementary steps needed to preserve it. To promote the aggressive designs of Germany, to help her sinister policy of breaking up the Triple Entente, we actually have our Ministers announcing *urbi et orbi* that we are under no military obligations to support the cause of France, though to every intelligent patriot the cause of France is nowadays the cause of England and the cause of Europe. The outlook is anything but agreeable, but German intrigue has been defeated so often before, while its tools have been discredited, that we are entitled to hope history will repeat itself.

The Progress of an Idea

In spite of the feebleness and folly of our professional politicians, the zeal of the German Press bureau in our midst, the simplicity and treachery of certain newspapers, the poisonous peace propaganda permeating the North of England (which is understood to be financed by one of the many undesirable aliens who make this country their home in order to destroy her), there are stimulating signs of an awakening public opinion, which, though slow and sure, cannot fail to prevail in the long run—if only time were on our side. Lord Roberts' pious pilgrimage to great industrial centres like Bristol, Wolverhampton, and Leeds, where he is greeted not only with the respect which is his due, but with the enthusiasm his personality always inspires wherever he goes, has been the main factor in this new consciousness. Those who have accompanied him have been amazed by the size and the interest of

the vast crowds which he has managed to address, and by the deep impression he has made by sincere and simple speeches spoken from the heart to the heart. His audiences have been chiefly working men; indeed great pains have been taken by the admirable organisers of these great gatherings to get as many working men as possible within range of his voice, and it is evident that it is not among the working classes, as some superior persons appear to imagine, that the chief difficulty resides of persuading Englishmen that the time has come when they must either consent to take a back seat in the civilised world or be prepared to make a great personal effort, and if need be a personal sacrifice in order to hold what their forefathers gained. The difficulty lies rather in the classes above them owing to the growth of materialism, which is not the monopoly of the Have-nots, but an obsession of the Haves, the main ambition of a large proportion of whom is to spend on themselves money they haven't got. We see the same phenomenon in every rank of life, and it forms a dangerous barrier to patriotism and national service. That the cause of which Lord Roberts is the personification will win is beyond doubt, as may be gathered from the enraged comments of that portion of the Press which represents the most selfish and sordid section of the community, the middle-class Radical Cobdenite. Lord Roberts makes no efforts at oratory, but contents himself with reminding his hearers of the elementary facts of human history, including British history and of the world in which we live, while recalling them to that sense of duty which has been the inspiration of preceding generations, who have made us the Great Power we still are. Even the bitterest enemy of "Militarism" cannot pretend that Lord Roberts has any axe to grind, and the spectacle of this grand old man on a mission to his countrymen is the most inspiring episode of our time.

A Palpable Trap

THE country is under a great obligation to the *Times* and the *Daily Mail* for the eloquent and effective backing which they have given to National Service, a question which even politicians can no longer afford to pooh-pooh, and even though their utterances on problems concerning national defence remain in most cases as obsolete as ever it is self-evident that many of them no longer

believe the rubbish they talk. We always felt confident we should live to see the exposure and humiliation of that worst of all quacks, Lord Haldane, who hoped to find refuge on the Woolsack before he was found out at the War Office. Happily he escaped too late, and to-day no serious person can be found to say a word for the Haldane policy, which is seen to have been "eye-wash," and so far from living in history as the modern Carnot, the organiser of victory, he will take his place with such organisers of disaster as the Le Bœufs. If he had any sense of shame he would never venture to open his mouth on the Army again, and if his countrymen had sufficient self-respect they would never listen to anything he said on any aspect of National Defence. But the House of Lords has learnt to suffer windbags gladly, and Lord Haldane meanders on, talking the same nonsense with which he used to bamboozle the House of Commons, though fortunately there is generally somebody on the spot capable of effectively contrasting the facts as presented from the Woolsack and the facts as they really are. Nothing is perhaps more eloquent of the confessed failure of the Government to assure the safety of the State than their effort to compromise the Opposition by inviting Mr. Balfour to sit on a Committee or a sub-Committee of the Defence Committee, which is supposed to be engaged in a solemn enquiry as to the invadability of these shores. We are exceedingly sorry that an old parliamentary hand like the ex-Prime Minister should have walked into such a palpable trap. The Defence Committee is a sham invented by the politician to fool the people into believing that there is a serious body devoted to working out in peace time the problems of war. The Defence Committee is nothing of the kind; it is a more or less casual gathering of politicians, soldiers, and sailors, to which the Prime Minister can summon any one he pleases, and from which he can exclude any one who displeases him, and any expert whose advice was unpalatable would very soon find himself left out of the picture. Even where the case is so overwhelming that even "tame" experts are unable to capitulate, the politicians have their own way, pursue the policy that is condemned, and there is no machinery for acquainting the people with what the non-political portion of the Defence Committee have really thought, said, and demanded.

Reducing the Invaders

EVERY one knows that the object of the new enquiry is to reduce the number of hypothetical invaders of this country in order to meet the situation created by the collapse of the Territorial Force. If there were 900,000 Territorials as originally adumbrated, it would have been possible to concede an invasion of, say, 200,000 Germans; but as the Territorial Force never rose to 300,000, the German invasion has had to be kept down to a maximum of 70,000, because it must bear a certain proportion to the Territorials. Should the latter fall to 100,000 the German invaders would be officially reduced to 25,000, and so on. The object of the new enquiry is to reduce the number of Germans in order to keep pace with the fall in Territorials. The reason that Mr. Balfour has been invited to participate is in order to save the bacon of the present Government, who, in the probable event of the catastrophe for which they have long prepared, would be able to turn round on the country, insisting that the Opposition were jointly responsible because on the eve of disaster Mr. Balfour sat on an enquiry which decided whatever follies are about to be decided. It is therefore essential emphatically to disclaim any Unionist responsibility for the decision of a body whose whole record inspires distrust, and which is to render a preconsidered verdict.

Army and Navy

AMONG healthier signs of the times, which may likewise be attributed to Lord Roberts' influence, it is observable that while the politicians are afraid to tell the people the truth, which is tantamount to a vote of censure on themselves during the last seven years, distinguished soldiers and sailors are not above doing so. On the same day that Lord Curzon was pulverising Lord Haldane in the House of Lords (April 21) and making an appeal to both parties, which will certainly fall on deaf ears, Admiral Prince Louis of Battenberg, the First Sea Lord, made an important declaration at the Union Jack Club, which offers a contrast to the speeches we used to hear from one of his predecessors, who regarded the whole duty of a citizen as confined to "sleeping quietly in his bed." It is refreshing to hear a First Sea Lord telling an English audience that "he trusted that the one great truth would always be remembered that neither Service could

dispense with the other. They heard a good deal of loose talking on the matter; it sometimes took the shape of friendly chaff, but all the same it existed. There were people who went about saying, 'If war comes the Fleet alone is quite enough to keep anybody from coming anywhere near the shores of this island kingdom.' There could be no more foolish or mischievous statement. The Fleet alone could not do it." Then came these memorable words: "The presence of a sufficiently trained professional Army in these islands at all times was quite as necessary as the other arm of the Service." The complement came from Sir John French at the Annual Dinner of the London Chamber of Commerce (April 24). General French declared that for reasons "I am unable to fathom or understand, the question of our military needs seems to be centred altogether on this problem of raids and invasions, for one often hears the opinion expressed that, if we have no fear of invasion, why do we want an Army at all." This was simply to forget our own history. The position of the British Empire to-day was largely due to the British Army. "Did we want an Army in the days of Marlborough or in the time of the Peninsula? Was the Battle of Waterloo fought and won by a British Army or not? Did we want an Army in the Crimea, in India, in Egypt, or in South Africa? We must perfect the forces necessary to secure our Imperial and wide-world interests." Why don't the politicians talk in this strain. A campaign of education would be infinitely more useful than any hole-and-corner meetings of hugger-mugger Committees, whose decisions will only be published in the event of their suiting the party exigencies of the moment.

Free Food Intrigues

The so-called Edinburgh compromise bisecting Tariff Reform into two parts is working exactly as might have been foreseen, namely as an encouragement to a handful of Conservative Cobdenites to intrigue against the policy of the Party. First in one constituency, then in another, a candidate crops up who, when planted on the electors, will obviously devote himself to torpedoing Tariff Reform, even though for the moment he may feel constrained to pay sufficient lip-service to be adopted. So far these efforts have not been conspicuously successful, but the Free Fooders have apparently brought off one coup. South

Kensington is one of the great Unionist strongholds of London, instinct with patriotism and Imperialism—an ideal constituency for a man of brains, character, and independence. It has been whole-heartedly in favour of the "first constructive work" of the Unionist Party ever since Mr. Chamberlain launched his policy. It has no weakness for mugwumps, and has never been represented by one. Lord Castlereagh, though nominally a Tariff Reformer, very nominally, is believed to have been one of the most active back-stairs spade-workers for the dropping of the Imperial policy. Moreover he holds a comfortable seat at Maidstone, which may be a suitable field for Suffragist operations. It was therefore somewhat surprising to learn from the public Press (April 19), under the heading of Election Intelligence, that in the first place "Lord Castlereagh intimated about a month ago that he had decided not to stand again for Maidstone, as his private interests lie so much in the north that he feels he cannot serve the constituency as he would like to do"; secondly, that "the Executive Committee of the South Kensington Conservative Association have now decided to recommend Lord Castlereagh to the Association for adoption as prospective Unionist candidate upon the retirement of Lord Claud Hamilton, M.P." The retirement of Lord Claud Hamilton was not unexpected, but it is nevertheless regrettable, as he was an admirable representative of this great constituency. But it is doubly regrettable owing to the unfortunate arrangement threatened whereby a Unionist seat at Maidstone is placed in jeopardy, and a not particularly suitable candidate is forced upon South Kensington. There is humour, as always, in these episodes, as we are invited to infer that South Kensington is somewhere in the north of England, presumably in Durham, where Lord Castlereagh's private interests lie. This is a brilliant instance how not to do it, unless the writer of this paragraph is a wag of the first water. The time is at hand, if it has not already arrived, when the rank and file of the Unionist Party will claim some voice in the selection of candidates rather than ratify whoever may be presented to them by some more or less irresponsible and unrepresentative Committee. Committees on their side will certainly have to take into account the suitability of particular men for particular constituencies, and we should hardly have thought that a politician of Lord

Castlereagh's colour, a half-hearted Tariff Reformer and an ardent Suffragist, was quite the right man in the right place. Our readers should be warned that measures are afoot in Manchester under the auspices of the same men who organised the winter scuttle with the object of dropping the whole policy of Tariff Reform. If the *National Review* gave prizes for essays we should be disposed to offer a substantial sum for the best account of the gain accruing to Unionism from the so-called Edinburgh compromise.

A Marconi Budget

THE shadow of Marconi sits heavily on the House of Commons and the Coalition are down in the dumps, for bad as are the revelations so far, there may be more to come, and it is generally recognised that whenever the subject is discussed Ministers will find themselves in a very tight place unless obliging Unionist lawyers come to their rescue. However we need not say a word on the matter here, as it is superabundantly dealt with elsewhere. Mr. Lloyd George's latest, if not his last, Budget, presented to the House of Commons on April 22, bore the same speculative character as his private transactions. Politicians were indeed disposed to regard it as an electioneering Budget, as it imposed no new taxation, although there is to be an immense increase of expenditure and the finance of the year 1913–14 rests on the agreeable assumption that the revenue of the boom year 1912 will repeat itself. No margin is provided and no reserve for a rainy day, although the horizon is anything but cloudless. Mr. Lloyd George builds on sand, and were he anticipating a successor at the Exchequer he could not have been more improvident. The party of peace, retrenchment, and reform has brought us within sight of a £200,000,000 Budget without providing national security on any element. In spite of predictions of an approaching election—and of course a collapse is always possible—the Government are bound to cling to office, as otherwise the whole policy of the Parliament Bill would be a fiasco from which the Party would take half a generation to recover. We may therefore be sure that the resources of the limpets will be exhausted and that every form of degradation will be preferred to the dread ordeal of dissolution.

THE GREAT MARCONI MYSTERY

PREFATORY

THERE are several ways of dealing with a long and complicated story. The simplest is to abstain from even trying to tell it. Or, again, you may tell it from the beginning to the end, or alternatively from the end to the beginning. Otherwise you may start from some suitable spot between the beginning and the end and set forth such salient facts as will make the whole intelligible.

I confess to being unable to abstain from an attempt to narrate the Great Marconi Mystery, though it would tax the pen of a Conan Doyle, assisted by the brains of a Sherlock Holmes, to do anything approaching justice to it. I cannot begin at the beginning, as the beginning is still shrouded in obscurity; nor can one work back from the end, because the end is not in sight. So there is no choice but to plunge into the middle and keep steadily to the high road, scrupulously resisting every temptation to deviate down any of the fascinating by-paths, and endeavour to present the reader with a broad outline of the position so far as it has developed at the time of writing. These pages are indeed in the nature of an interim report from an interested onlooker which may prove a useful guide to those who wish to pick their way among the ramifications, appreciate developments impending and a future charged with possible surprise.

Ordinarily one would prefer to await the conclusion of a question technically *sub judice*, but in effect the Marconi question has at no time been *sub judice*, for at every stage of its amazing

career it has been the subject of keen and occasionally furious controversy. There is consequently no excuse for the attitude of those highly respectable Yes-No Mugwumps so powerfully represented in the Unionist Press so-called, who excuse themselves from forming any conclusion or pronouncing any judgment until we have the considered opinion of Mr. Handel Booth—the hero of the Ramsden case. We may never have the considered judgment of Mr. Handel Booth, but meanwhile we have the unconsidered judgment of the entire Handel Booth Press, from the Jesuitical *Westminster Gazette* to the blatant *Reynolds' Newspaper*—whose Managing Director, the Right Hon. Sir Henry Dalziel, M.P., was, be it remembered, selected by the Prime Minister as an ornament of His Majesty's Privy Council—which are equally enlisted in one common determined effort to poison the wells of public opinion, while superior persons wrap themselves in self-complacent slumber and refuse to commit themselves until the Booths and the Falconers are pleased to render their verdict. Months have already been wantonly wasted on irrelevancies, and it is high time for that portion of the community which prefers clean government to what we have got, and is prepared to take off its coat and work and fight for it, and cleanse the augean stables, to cease standing on its dignity, which simply means acquiescing in the establishment of Panama Government in this country as the natural adjunct of the Costa Rica Constitution which we owe to the labours of our present Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith.

It must be already clear to every self-respecting Englishman and Englishwoman who have been at any pains to appreciate the elementary, sordid facts already established on oath that this is no exaggerated language. Should the country either through ignorance or indifference condone the misdeeds already exposed and confessed, then Great Britain, who has not without some justification hitherto held her head high in the comity of nations—because, however ignorant or stupid or unimaginative our public men might seem to be to foreigners, they at any rate passed for being personally truthful and personally honest—has reached the inclined plane on which not a few democracies are already gliding towards the conditions prevailing in the more unregenerate of South American republics. Although not

a member of the noble army of optimists who see everything through rose-coloured spectacles and believe all they see and something more, I don't believe that the British people have sunk so low as to pass over the performances of Mr. Asquith and his colleagues. But in any event it would not be fair to condemn the people at large until they have been given some chance of ascertaining the facts. It is notorious that the organised forces of the Coalition—fighting for its life—working through the Press, the platform, the tabernacles, some of the synagogues, Trade Union wirepullers, and in a thousand diverse and sinister ways, supported by huge financial interests, form one gigantic sleepless conspiracy to bamboozle the nation. The misleading headlines and the garbled reports of the evidence, firstly of the action which the Postmaster-General (Mr. Herbert Samuel) and the Attorney-General (Sir Rufus Isaacs) found themselves constrained to bring against the French newspaper, *Le Matin*, and secondly of the proceedings before the Marconi Committee, supply suggestive evidence of the nobbling of newspapers, some of which might have been expected to know better.

There has been a complete change of tone in the Coalition Press since the startling confessions of Sir Rufus Isaacs in his libel action—upon which it would be highly interesting to obtain further and better particulars. Prior to that sensational case, any one who hazarded the suggestion that Ministers had probably been unable to resist the temptation to gamble in Marconi shares were forthwith relegated—somewhat prematurely as it now appears—to the category of confessed forgers and convicted criminals, but since that case Radical journalists, with one conspicuous and honourable exception—Mr. Massingham of the *Nation*—have performed their customary *volte face* when the interests of the Coalition are in danger, and to-day they encourage their readers, of whose intelligence they evidently entertain the meanest opinion, to regard Ministerial speculations in Marconi shares not only as a perfectly natural and proper proceeding, but almost as a meritorious act, and doubtless before long amiable correspondents who have lapped up the milk provided for them by their esteemed editors will be writing letters to the *Westminster Gazette*, the *Manchester Guardian*, the *Daily News and Leader*, the *Daily Chronicle*, *Reynolds' Newspaper*—possibly even

to our strangely silent contemporary *Punch*—urging that the Prime Minister should advise the King to confer the Order of Merit on any of his colleagues who may have invested, either in person or by proxy, in any shares of any Marconi Company, whether it be British,* American, Canadian, Spanish, or any other of the lusty offspring of this fruitful mother.

It is, however, only quite recently that the admirers and supporters of the Government have countenanced this particular investment, so I hardly think that I could select a more suitable starting-point for this narrative—which is intended neither for financial nor political experts, but solely for the purpose of assisting the all-powerful man in the street, who has other business to attend to and cannot give his days and nights to digesting the ever-accumulating details by which this case is becoming encumbered, to form a sound judgment on a topic which no man has a right to shirk—than the articles which appeared in the Government Press at a time when Ministerial writers thought they were entitled to believe the Cabinet to be exclusively composed of Cæsar's wives—a phrase continually on the pens of Coalition writers and on the tongues of Coalition orators, including *mirabile dictu* Mr. Lloyd George.

* I include the British Marconi Company, because should it transpire that Ministers honoured this company as they have the American Company, the *Westminster Gazette* and Co. would doubtless justify if it could not applaud the transaction

I. "RUMOURS"

I apologise for bringing myself into a story which transcends all personal issues, but the Coalition Press for about ten days emptied its gutter-squirts over me, and it was during this operation that opinions were expressed by Radical writers which are worth recalling, because not only do they give us the measure of the degradation which has since overtaken the Ministerial Press, but likewise of the irretrievable damnation of Ministers who shall be judged by their own partisans at a time when these simpletons sincerely imagined that of all wicked suggestions that could be made against the honourable and high-minded Members of Mr. Asquith's God-given Cabinet none surpassed in criminal malignancy the insinuation that they might have gambled in Marconi shares. That there was no distinction drawn in those days between the British, the American, the Canadian, the Spanish, or any other Marconi Company is evident from the statements of ardent Radicals. The written word remains, and moreover one leading Radical journalist, but only one so far as I know from an attentive perusal of the Coalition Press, has actually had the courage to stand by what he said while his fellow journalists have devoted themselves to the congenial task of eating their words. As I have said, I should much prefer to remain out of the picture, but all these diatribes were provoked by my evidence before the Marconi Select Committee on February 12 and by the action of that Committee in reporting me to the House for refusing to betray confidences. The purport of that evidence is therefore relevant, and I make no apology for referring to it, not so much on account of its intrinsic value as for the fortunate fact that it induced Ministerial newspapers to provide us with a standard by which to measure the offences which Ministers have since been compelled to confess, doubtless through fear of exposure elsewhere. The reader must continually ask himself in considering this part

of the case—and the answer should help him to form a judgment upon the tragedy of the Government—" if the mere suggestion that Ministers might have been guilty of gambling in Marconi shares was so wicked as to place any one giving currency to it in the category of criminals, what is the position of Ministers who to-day stand confessed gamblers or 'investors' in Marconi shares?" Dismiss, as I have said, all distinctions between the "associated" Marconi Companies, for the simple reason that no such distinctions were then drawn either by "scandal-mongers" like myself before the Marconi Committee nor by Coalition commentators; Mr. Massingham, the editor of the *Nation*, has frankly stated the obvious truth, viz. that Ministerial repudiations of Marconi speculations were interpreted by the public as covering the whole group of Marconi Companies. Now let us come to the facts, though I would claim in advance that if it be shown to the reader's satisfaction that the Coalition Press before the confessions in the *Matin* case regarded it as a crime to accuse Ministers of doing what *ex hypothesi* they were incapable of doing, the *volte face* of that same Press, after the confession of Ministers that they had committed the unforgivable sin, places the organs of the Government to-day in the same odious light as the Members of the Government.

In referring to the fateful, and as it now turns out, fatal debate on the Marconi Agreement in the House of Commons last October 11, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Attorney-General, and the Postmaster-General made uncompromising denials with so much display of sincerity and indignation as to mislead the public, I pointed out to the Marconi Committee *inter alia* that "The Chancellor of the Exchequer got up a perfectly gratuitous row with an old friend, Mr. George Lansbury, and in his excitement Mr. Lloyd George unfortunately omitted to deny that he had had any dealings in Marconi shares. If significance be attached to the denials of other Ministers, which we are invited to regard as final, some significance must surely be attached to Mr. Lloyd George's omission, which may have been an oversight." The readers of this Review are now in a position to judge whether that was a violent or exaggerated statement. I added:

The public are undoubtedly uneasy about this business, because the rumours about particular Ministers—not the Postmaster-General—are circumstantial and

persistent, and it may be hoped that whatever else it may do the present Committee may be able to vindicate the fame of one and all of his Majesty's Ministers. I confess to sharing the general uneasiness as matters stand at present. Nearly four months have elapsed since the discussion in the House of Commons, but Ministers have done nothing whatsoever to dispel the mist of suspicion overhanging the affair. Mr. Samuel stated that Ministers "will be most ready to appear before"—I am quoting him—the Committee. One might have conceived that they would have appeared at its first sitting clamouring to state in the most categorical and emphatic manner that neither directly nor indirectly, in their own names or in other people's names, have they had any transactions whatsoever, either in London, Dublin, New York, Brussels, Amsterdam, Paris, or any other financial centre, in any shares in *any* (sic) Marconi Company throughout the negotiations with the Government, and that neither they nor any of their belongings have participated in the profitable rings, pools, and syndicates for dealing in options of which there are believed to have been an unusual number in this business. Doubtless they will be willing to produce the pass-books of all their accounts at every bank at which they bank, fortified by the evidence of the bank managers, in order to clear the matter up so far as such evidence is conclusive. The public is equally entitled to know that Ministers privy to the negotiations did not take advantage of such knowledge to put their friends on to "a good thing" at the expense of less privileged individuals, as this would have been a decidedly undemocratic proceeding.

This statement is now seen to be almost ludicrous in its moderation. It contained one valuable word in italics, viz. the word *any*, which not only includes the American Marconi Company—now in the limelight—but likewise the Spanish and the Canadian and other Marconi Companies, of which we may hear more anon as several offered golden opportunities of turning an honest penny to favoured beings in the know, whether outside or inside the Ministry. I use the word Ministry advisedly, because it is larger than the Cabinet, and in these matters it is as well to be as comprehensive as possible when dealing with slippery customers.

During the ensuing cross-examination, which was opened by Mr. Parker, Vice-Chairman of the Labour Party, I necessarily refused, as would any one in my place, to disclose sources of information received confidentially, the reliability of which is no longer open to question. This "contumacy" was regarded by the Select Committee as a breach of the privileges of Parliament and was reported as such to the House of Commons. It is unnecessary to dwell on the episode, all the more as it remains open. It was, however, useful in riveting public attention on the Marconi Mystery and in drawing the fire of the Radical

Press, which was beside itself with fury. Apparently any one who makes a confidence to a Radical editor does so at his peril, because there is no constraint on such journalist to observe the obligations of honour which are an unwritten law not only to every self-respecting editor throughout the civilised world, but likewise to every self-respecting man and woman. Any one rash enough to write a private letter for the personal information of a Coalition editor, or for anonymous publication in a Coalition journal, would be *ex hypothesi* liable to have his name handed over on demand to a political Committee, or presumably any other tribunal or quasi-tribunal. I do not imagine for a moment that even the most hysterical of Mr. Lloyd George's journalistic henchmen practise what they preach, but the doctrine has certainly been laid down in language that all who run may read as to the duty of editors to divulge private correspondence and private conversations. Radicalism has, in truth, long ceased to be a creed; it is a scream, and many of those afflicted by the disease shout the first thing that comes into their heads suitable to the exigencies of the moment. At that particular moment the plaster saints of the Cabinet could only be accused of gambling in Marconi shares either by people who had taken leave of their senses and should be dealt with accordingly, or by depraved and diabolical beings who grovelled in the gutter for garbage to fling at *Bayards sans peur et sans reproche*—whose greatness the aforesaid gutter-snipes were incapable of appreciating.

In order that there may be no doubt as to the attitude of Radicals prior to the confessions of Sir Rufus Isaacs in the *Matin* case, it is necessary in the first place to recall Mr. Parker's cross-examination of the present writer, before the Marconi Committee, as the issue is fairly stated between the parties.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Mr. Parker, will you ask Mr. Maxse whether he received n any of the confidential letters, which he has not produced, any evidence which satisfied his mind that there was any truth or ground for the statements that Ministers were gambling?

MR. JAMES PARKER (to the Witness): *Q.* You have heard the question? *A.* Yes. Unless I had been satisfied by the enquiries I made that there was, at any rate, strong ground for suspicion——

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: *Q.* I said "evidence"? *A.* We have not got the evidence; I have not had access to people's pass-books.

MR. JAMES PARKER: *Q.* Give your own answer? *A.* Unless I had been satisfied that there was strong ground for suspicion I, of course, should not have entered upon this affair.

Q. I want to follow that up a little. You say unless you had had evidence? *A.* I did not say evidence.

Q. Well, unless you had been satisfied that there was strong ground for suspicion you would not have followed up this affair in your articles in the *National Review*. What are your grounds for suspicion? *A.* My grounds for suspicion are that everybody whom I had consulted upon this question has somehow or other acquired the idea that there was gambling in Marconi shares, and that among the gamblers in Marconi shares have been members of the present Government. I am struck by the fact that from the month of July, when I began my enquiries, up to the present day, I have always been told the same thing, and the same Ministers have generally been mentioned in this connection.

Q. But you will not tell us who told you. *A.* I am not going to give you the names of people with whom I had private correspondence or conversation.

Q. Neither will you tell us what they told you? *A.* I will only tell you that they told me that particular Ministers—it was generally a particular group of Ministers—were believed to have participated in this gamble, and the thing was very generally believed in the City, and the City, I believe, continue to believe it. They may be quite wrong. If I may be allowed to refer to it, I think the case is very fairly stated in the *National Review*, and I have come here to justify it.

Q. I am coming to the articles in the *National Review* presently, but for the moment let us keep to the question. This Committee has been striving, in spite of what you say in the *National Review*, to get at some facts. We are out searching for facts, and the only way to obtain those facts is from witnesses who come before us? *A.* Or to get Ministers here.

Q. We will deal with that point. I am coming to that question at a later stage of my examination, but in the meantime I am dealing with such knowledge or such information as you can give us. All that you can give us is, so far as I understand, that you heard these rumours, that you wrote to certain people and that they supplied you with information? *A.* And I have talked to a great many people.

Q. When you wrote to certain people they supplied you with certain information which you say you cannot or will not disclose, and therefore you have not a single fact that you can place before this Committee to substantiate the suggestion that Ministers were connected with this corrupt activity on the Stock Exchange? *A.* I have not what would be regarded by lawyers as evidence, and I have never pretended to have evidence. I have called attention in the *National Review*—and that is the position that I maintain here—to the fact that owing to the circumstances under which this contract was negotiated, legitimate suspicions were aroused which have been persisted in from that day to this, and that owing to their own conduct and attitude—the attitude particularly of the Postmaster-General—their names have been brought into this affair, and there is a widespread belief held, rightly or wrongly, that Ministers participated in the gamble. That is not a charge of corruption, and I am not going to have the word "corruption" put upon me.

Again, later, Mr. James Parker:

Q. I will endeavour to meet you on the remarks you made yourself in your own précis, and on those things which you yourself have written in the *National Review* and I am going to endeavour to find out what facts you have to substantiate the statement, and if you can assist me in doing so I shall be delighted. If you cannot, then I shall know what value to place upon your statements? *A.* I have suggested to you a way to settle the whole thing, that is to get Ministers to come here and make a statement on oath.

Q. You will not get away from it with that? *A.* I do not want to get away from anything.

Q. We will deal with that when the proper time arrives. Up to now you have no definite fact to put before us which substantiates, in any degree, the wild statements that you yourself have made in the précis of your evidence, and in the *National Review*? *A.* I have made no wild statements. I have called attention to the fact that an unprecedented Stock Exchange gamble was allowed to go on while a Government Department was engaged in negotiations with a speculative company.

Q. I understand you to say you base practically all your charges upon what was laid down by Mr. Lawson in the articles which he wrote? *A.* Certainly not.

Q. You have information apart from Mr. Lawson? *A.* I have told you I have made enquiries on my own account quite apart from Mr. Lawson, and I always had the same answer.

Q. Mr. Lawson's reputation, I understood you to say in your précis of your evidence, was relied upon by you? *A.* I relied upon Mr. Lawson as a writer. I did not think of him as a witness.

Q. But you relied upon the facts which he put before you, and which were published in your journal? *A.* The statements that Mr. Lawson published in the *National Review* coincided with the statements I had heard otherwise, as regards that particular aspect of the case. On the technical business part of it on which he wrote, I of course was an amateur.

After some further discussion and demands for the production of letters from any persons who might have written concerning the rumours that Ministers had gambled in Marconi shares, the Committee, as I have said, reported the refusal of the witness to the House, and there apparently the matter remains for the present.

II. COALITION BOMBARDIERS

The bombardment of the Coalition Press began at once, and from a purely professional point of view one could not help regretting the waste of so much good powder and shot, though it is a peculiarity of the Marconi case that every successive incident has served some particular purpose, and this concerted attack is valuable to-day as indicating what leading Ministerial journals thought of the offence of Ministerial speculations in Marconi shares at a time when they were totally ignorant that there had been such speculations, and regarded any suggestion to that effect as the emanation of a diseased or vicious imagination. As I have already said, this surely affords some measure of the offence of Ministers in leaving their own friends in the dark as to what they had actually done, and helps us to realise the character of the offence now confessed. According to the *Daily Chronicle*, which is far from being the most violent of Coalition journals, and in which occasionally the note of moderation is heard:

This * is again assuming that Mr. Maxse is a serious controversialist seeking to discover the truth and anxious not to attack Ministers until he has some basis of fact to go on. But he and others have attacked Ministers over this Marconi business on mere vague, intangible, unsupported gossip and rumour. They have also developed a new theory of journalistic irresponsibility. Should the Minister, assailed by an inconspicuous and unscrupulous paper, or by a more serious weekly or a swashbuckling magazine, not deny vague charges founded on vaguer rumours, then it is at once assumed that he is guilty, and the attack is pushed home with reiterated emphasis. *Even when Ministers made direct, emphatic and complete denials in the House of Commons*

* The reference in the *Daily Chronicle* is to an article in the *Times* containing the following passage: "The position taken up by Mr. Maxse is one which it is essential to maintain, if the power of newspapers for good from time to time is not to be impaired. Much information and criticism beneficial to the public will necessarily be suppressed if those who communicate with editors are no longer assured that the confidence reposed in them will in all circumstances be respected. It is to the honour of English journalism that the implied promise given to correspondents has rarely been broken."

their repudiation is not accepted [my italics]. They are told that they give "evasive answers" and surround themselves with "impenetrable secrecy." In short, they are to be held guilty on every scribbler's accusation unless and until they go out of their way to disprove it. English public life cannot be and never has been conducted on such lines. Nor can English journalism be allowed to plead the confidential relations of those engaged in it as an excuse for libelling third parties.

Then we have the first thoughts of the *Manchester Guardian*, the mouthpiece of Progressive thought in the North of England, which we are always given to understand is an infinitely superior place to the benighted South. The *Manchester Guardian* has constituted itself the conscience keeper of the nation, and there is no question of morals at home or abroad upon which it is not prepared at any moment to deliver judgment in the approved style of the greater pontiffs of the Press. In this case it was the attitude of the Almighty to a blackbeetle (*see* the leading article in the *Manchester Guardian* of February 13 entitled "Professional Misconduct"):

Since the wretched Piggott broke down under cross-examination during the Parnell Commission, no public offender against honour and decency in public controversy has suffered so prolonged and terrible an exposure of his offences, and of the degradation of character which made them possible, as the unfortunate man Lawson. The spectacle of this poor wretch raking together the dirtiest garbage of City gossip, all the foul tittle-tattle of party spite and the cunningly invented rumours of dishonest financial gamblers, and imposing the stuff on the ready credulity of the rancorous editors or owners of the *Outlook*, the *Eye-Witness*, and the *National Review*—the loathsomeness of this glimpse of an underworld of financial and journalistic baseness has appalled every reader of the Press.

The same article contained the following passage:

Nor are professional journalists, as a class, so destitute of sympathy with people who can possess their souls in quiet under detraction as to suppose that even the slightest authority is added to the calumnies of a Lawson or a Maxse by the fact that they are left contemptuously unnoticed. "They say? What say they? Let them say," is decent people's common rule of conduct when pestered by this kind of insect, and every decent journalist knows it. He knows, as well, the cant of pretended regard, on the part of detractors, for those whose honour they attack. It is commonly heard when some deservedly obscure periodical throws a handful of mud at some deservedly distinguished man or woman in the hope that it may itself be brought into publicity, if only by being caned in public. In short, the public should be on its guard against supposing that any of the general maxims of carelessness, hypocrisy, and dishonour ennunciated at the Marconi enquiry by the offenders whom it has brought into the light are maxims held by the profession of journalism at large. They are the maxims of its dregs; for any poor men who hold them one can only frame the excuse that perhaps they have to feed families and do not know how to sweep crossings.

Every one can appreciate the exquisite humour of the suggestion that a journalist had better starve on a crossing than suggest that any of Mr. Asquith's colleagues could conceivably commit the enormity of gambling in Marconi shares. The *Manchester Guardian*, which it may be as well for once to take as seriously as it takes itself, returned to the charge on the following day (February 14). Its editor is, I believe, a well-meaning, if misguided, man, Mr. C. P. Scott, and this was the manner in which on second thoughts he let himself go, or directed some one else to go:

Like his contributor Lawson, he (Maxse) seems to have based some very scurrilous and quite untrue imputations of corruption on the ordinary tattle of the lower kind of gossiping partisan. Some remnant of decency led Lawson, when challenged, to own his offence, admit that his informant was rumour, and acknowledge that those whom he had defamed were, as far as he knew, perfectly blameless. Even this modicum of courage and decency must have failed Mr. Maxse: when questioned by the Marconi Committee he shirked the manly course of admitting his offence, attempted to insinuate that rumour was not a lying jade after all, and adopted a histrionic pose as the loyal editor who will not give away his private informants.

. . . .

That course is both swaggering and cowardly, a boast and a running away. It would not have profited Mylius, the man who defamed the King, and it should as little profit Mr. Maxse, an equally reckless traducer. The *Times* suggests that if our Myliuses and Maxses are not safeguarded in the enjoyment of these aids to calumny "the power of newspapers for good" will be "impaired," and that "good sense and the practice of honourable men" would countenance a kind of unofficial extension of the law of privilege to the mutual dealings of the various partners in the purveying of such stuff as the Mylius or Maxse slanders.

In those happy far-off days to accuse pure and immaculate Ministers of Marconi speculations was comparable to accusing the King of bigamy. From the *Daily News and Leader* one usually expects entertainment rather than edification, though which part of the combination the "*News*" or the "*Leader*" provides most merriment I am unable to say. In an article entitled "The Campaign of Slander" (February 14), our combined contemporaries thus testified:

In view of the period of the Session, the most that Mr. Maxse, in embarking on his plan of calculated impudence, had to fear was a derisory term of comfortable seclusion, and in dealing with a person of his calibre it would have been obviously unwise for the House to proceed against him at a moment when it possesses no effective means of enforcing its authority.

It is not, however, in compulsion, but in the general reprobation of decent-minded

people that the real defence of the public must be found against a venomous scurrility which is poisoning political life. In particular, journalists with a regard for their reputation owe it to their profession to repudiate as decisively as possible the ethics of the ashpit promulgated by Mr. Maxse, and his attempt to screen the real character of his investigations into the garbage of pot-house gossip behind the doctrine of editorial secrecy.

. . . .

It is a great pity that there is no organised and authoritative body which could stigmatise in the name of the profession conduct which no responsible man outside it will fail to regard as infamous. In default of such a body it remains for writers who value their self-respect to dissociate themselves from it utterly, and to make it clear that the only valid doctrine of "editorial responsibility" is that what a man says he can prove, and that what he cannot prove he does not say. There are, of course, pens which are indifferent to considerations of honour, and where politics are concerned there are on both sides a certain number of men with whom intemperance and suspicion are a disease. But there is only one side in politics on which the journals inspired by acrimonious fanaticism have a perfectly free and unchecked run. At any moment a word from any Front Bench Unionist to the effect that he did not believe the King's Ministers, with most of whom he was in constant touch on the terms of social intercourse, had engaged in dishonourable practices would have brought the campaign of calumny tumbling to the ground.

Ministers stand sorely in need of a certificate of character from Mr. Bonar Law or Lord Lansdowne.

The more cautious *Westminster Gazette*, which prefers the fence to any form of responsibility and whose editor, being on exceptionally confidential terms with Mr. Asquith, may conceivably have received a hint not to press the matter too far, while its confrères were literally foaming at the mouth, produced one of those slimy casuistical articles of which it keeps an abundance in stock upon every question, committing itself to nothing in particular while condemning all reflections upon Ministers. In "A Question of Ethics" (*Westminster Gazette*, February 13), it was laid down that any editor referring to rumours concerning public men "must project himself into the witness-stand and ask himself how, without divulging names, he will be able to make good the allegations for which in that case he will have taken sole responsibility." This is beside the mark, as every editor, including the editor of the *Westminster Gazette*, knows that names or no names the conductors of every journal are always responsible for what they publish. Every editor necessarily considers every reflection upon individuals with a view to the law of libel,

which is exceptionally stringent in this country. Among the grievances to which aggrieved Ministers have given emphatic expression is that the *Outlook* and the *National Review* have kept within the law of libel, but they have only kept within the law of libel because the suggestion that Ministers have misbehaved themselves happens to be true. The *Westminster Gazette* added:

> If this leads him (*i.e.* the wicked editor) at the beginning to bear in mind that a vast deal of floating gossip, and even of precise statement made on apparently plausible evidence, will, when sifted, prove totally devoid of foundation, this will be no bad thing for him and his newspaper. But if, having gone forward in good faith he fails, then upon him must fall the brunt of failure and honest withdrawal. He is not, in such a case entitled to say that he would have succeeded if he had been able to divulge names which he is bound to keep secret.

But what of the case where the persons aspersed, Ministers to wit, deem it wisest to come forward at the twelfth hour and confess that, despite their own assertions made in their places in Parliament and generally interpreted as specific pledges that none of them had speculated in Marconi shares, that the rumours coupling their names with Stock Exchange gambles are not merely well founded, but absolutely accurate? What, then, one would like to ask the *Westminster Gazette* or any of the other accredited mouthpieces of the Coalition is the position of the wicked editors of the *Outlook* or the *National Review* or their "infamous" contributor who called attention to such rumours? What, again, is the position of those other editors who blackguarded the circulators of such rumours as though they were the vilest criminals? Our profession undoubtedly needs some authoritative body to lay down the law in such matters, to call its transgressors to account and to hold them up to public reprobation.

Another luminary of the Coalition Press is the *Star*, which divides its time between inciting people, especially of the poorer classes, to squander their money on that least remunerative of all forms of speculation betting, and, going one better politically than the *Daily News and Leader*—organs to which it bears the same sort of relationship as one Marconi Company to another. The *Star* was pleased to inform the world, "What We Think" on February 13, and for once it said something worth quoting:

> We did not think it possible that anything could possibly occur in the course of the

Marconi enquiry which would place the conduct of Mr. Lawson in a more favourable light. We were mistaken. The attitude adopted by Mr. Maxse yesterday shows that there was a still lower depth of malevolent irresponsibility. Mr. Lawson had the grace to withdraw innuendoes which he could not substantiate. Mr. Maxse, the editor and proprietor of the *National Review*, did not do so. He refused to produce his evidence, but he stuck to his innuendoes. He stated that he had received a good deal of evidence. He wrote letters to various people and got answers. He refused to produce either his own letters or the replies. He refused to give the names of his confidants. He stated that he had letters bearing on the rumours, but he declined to produce them.

. . . .

The whole point is that as a witness he is discredited by his failure to prove his insinuations against Ministers of the Crown. The Committee are "sick of rumours," and they asked him for his facts. He could give them no facts. He said he had received information from certain persons which satisfied him that there were grounds for suspicion. The Committee asked him to give the names. He refused. We say that he ought to be treated as if he knew nothing whatever about the matter. So far as the public is concerned, his insinuations and innuendoes are absolutely worthless. His evidence does not exist. He is not in being as a witness. In a Court of Justice he would be in the dock.

That is a very simple way of disposing of all critics of the powers-that-be which every tyrant has availed himself of, and doubtless should the present régime endure sufficiently long to establish the absolutism at which it aims every Opposition journalist will find himself liable to be hailed before some Star Chamber—possibly presided over by the editor of the *Star*, assisted by the inevitable Captain Cocoa—by whom he will be despatched to some oubliette. This is a "popular" operation in Portugal to-day, where Lloyd Georgism is in the ascendant.

The reader would weary of any more of this bluster, though plenty could be collected from Radical journals scattered up and down the country. It fell very flat, but I emphasise its value in enabling us to pronounce upon Ministers who have speculated in Marconi shares. Their admirers treated those who suggested that they had probably yielded to temptation as mad dogs.

Then another tack was tried, cajolery in lieu of coercion. Mr. H. W. Massingham, the editor of the *Nation*, contributed an article to the *Daily News and Leader* (February 17) entitled "The Maxse Case," summoning the present writer "to prove or withdraw." There was, of course, the inevitable reference to Piggott and the *Times*, to whom Piggott was alleged to have "sold a pup." I may say in passing that I have long doubted

as to the foundation of the legend dear to Home Rulers in difficulties as to the extent to which the *Times* was "sold a pup" by Piggott. Was it an entire pup or only portions of a pup? I suspect that future generations will take a very different view of this transaction—when the prison-house surrenders its secrets. However, that is another story. According to Mr. Massingham, in this article in the *Daily News and Leader*:

It (the *Times*) proceeded in the matter of Parnell much as Mr. Maxse has proceeded in the matter of Cabinet Ministers and Marconi shares with, I imagine, much the same mixture of motives. It uttered a sort of a kind of a libel, which it knew or must have known it was very difficult to prove in court, with an English jury to decide and an English Conservative Judge to direct the jury. It mixed its accusations of vile political conduct with a mass of specious attack on very debatable political doings, as to which Nationalists and Liberals would be inclined to think one thing and Unionists and Tories another. It refused all legal or precise proof, all information as to source. It was only by great ingenuity and a long and terribly expensive process that the truth was wrung from it and the wretched scarecrow's disguise was torn from him. In the course of the disclosures the world discovered that the *Times* had not made the slightest attempt to verify the letters, or to examine the character of the man who forged them.

I would reiterate that I do not believe for a single moment that the *Times* acted as described, but time alone can verify this. Mr. Massingham continued:

Much the same processes seem to have been employed in the case of these charges, or rather insinuations, in connection with the sale of the Marconi shares. Obviously they were prejudiced by the fact that Party feeling, and a good deal of obvious personal spite and venom were mixed up with them. And right-minded men must also have been prejudiced by the slippery unfairness of the method employed. No one, neither Mr. Oliver (editor of the *Outlook*) nor Mr. Maxse, nor his wretched "expert," said fair and square: "On such and such a day of such a week, such and such a Minister under such and such a name bought so many Marconi shares for so much, and then sold them at such and such a price." No one said that any Minister had in any specific case put a friend up to "a good thing" in Marconi shares. All that was said was that some unnamed people in City offices, or tap-rooms, or club arm-chairs had said so, and that they knew that some one had told them that they knew a man round the corner who was a clerk in the broker's office who negotiated the shares. But that was enough. Everybody who wanted to believe these things believed them. The clubs rang with them, and ring with them still. The rich man's hatred of a great people's Minister winged the lies and double-distilled the poison. Proofs! What proofs did the Duchess of Darlington want to convince her that Mr. Lloyd George was the devil's favourite child?

According to Mr. Massingham:

When all this mud-slinging is transferred from the newspaper office to the Committee-room the atmosphere is changed. Parliament is the High Court of Parliament, and

Parliament can call for evidence and demand the production of persons. Straightway the whole edifice of slush melts away . . . "Produce your gossips," says Parliament. "I can't produce some of them, for I have destroyed their letters; and I won't produce others because they wrote or spoke to me in confidence," retorts Mr. Maxse. "Very well then," the public will reply, "prove your case without them. Give us one definite statement which can be traced. Don't cover your paper with false malicious tittle-tattle about Mr. George's mansions and motor-cars, but say what he did that was wrong or low-minded in the matter of the Marconi shares. Or else own up. Prove or withdraw."

This noteworthy article ended by pointing out that the present writer "may be right to shelter others, for whose idle tongues he has stood credit, but he must go into the thick of the storm himself. Otherwise we shall all know what to think. For if he substantiates any one point of his real though disguised case *he has ruined the Government*." (My italics.) Such was the judgment pronounced in anticipation in the columns of the *Daily News and Leader* by Mr. Massingham, the editor of the *Nation*, a month before the revelations in the *Matin* case. There is no loophole for any evasion, not that Mr. Massingham stoops to evasion, as he is the one Radical journalist who has shown any honesty in this controversy, for he has so far stood to his guns, though how long he will be able to do so considering the atmosphere in which he necessarily moves and lives and has his being is another matter. His confrères of the Coalition Press live alternately on bounce and casuistry, and to-day they are seeking, in defiance of all the facts, to make impossible distinctions between various Marconi Companies—affirming that whereas it would be wicked of Ministers to speculate in British Marconi shares, it is the height of virtue to "invest" in American Marconi shares. Doubtless should other Ministers confess to the former crime a new code would be set up to meet the new situation, and we should learn that the mere fact that Ministers "invested" in British Marconi shares afforded conclusive evidence of their good faith in entering into contractual relations with the Marconi Company, as it proved their willingness to back their opinion in the approved way. However, Mr. Massingham is above this sort of thing. The *Nation*, of which he is the editor (March 22, 1913), in commenting on the *Matin* disclosures, observed:

We feel bound to say that in common with the rest of the public we were under the

impression that the charges or suggestions of Ministerial dealings in any shares associated with the various Marconi Companies had been disposed of by Sir Rufus Isaacs' statement in the House of Commons on October 11. It appears that we were wrong . . . in concluding that the Attorney-General's denial had reference simply to dealings in the shares of the parent Company (with which the Government's contract was made) under circumstances implying corruption . . . Sir Rufus Isaacs confined himself to repelling this capital accusation. But we are bound to offer the comment that the public gave his denial a wider range, and understood it to falsify the mass of gossip which attributed *any* participation by *any* Ministers in *any* Marconi undertaking.

Here, again, we obtain a clear standard by which to measure the mystification (to use the mildest possible word) practised by Ministers upon a deluded country last October. Rhetorical artifice, hysterical emotion, every form of quibble were alike enlisted to conceal from the country one of the most discreditable transactions in our parliamentary history, and one which can never be washed away even by the unlimited oceans of ink now pouring from Coalition pens with the object of fuddling the public upon transactions confessed to by the culprits themselves.

III. A NEAR SHAVE

For some time after the adjournment of the Marconi Committee on February 12, which automatically ceased to exist at the end of last Session, Ministers allowed if they did not encourage their newspapers to continue making fools of themselves in the manner we have seen, in spite of the fact, which is perhaps the most important as it is certainly not the least discreditable of all recent disclosures, that Mr. Asquith, the Premier of the Ministry of Mendacity, was aware ever since the month of July that two of his colleagues in the Cabinet and the Chief Whip of the Party had gambled or speculated or "invested," whichever term may be preferred, in American Marconi shares before the completion of the contract between the parent Marconi Company and the British Government and *a fortiori* before its ratification by Parliament. Whether he knew that they had private information originating with the Managing Director of the British company has not yet transpired.

Apart from the satisfaction of execrating the traducers of our Bayards, Radical newspapers were speedily provided with another agreeable topic, namely, the proceedings instituted by the Attorney-General and the Postmaster-General against the well-known French newspaper, *Le Matin*, which had grossly libelled them in its issue of February 14, *i.e.* two days after the Marconi Committee paid my evidence the honour of publication in a Special Report for presentation to the House of Commons. I have tried, without success so far, to get to the bottom of this *Matin* business, but I cherish hopes of doing so ultimately, as every episode in the Marconi Mystery is worth investigating. One thing is clear, viz. that while the Ministerial Press were beating their tom-toms, Ministers themselves were, to speak plainly, in a terrible funk. They had fondly hoped that the deplorable transactions in which some of them had become involved would never come out, and shrewd precautions against risks of disclosure had been taken. The *National*

Review had steadily and insistently, month by month, protested against the disastrous and inexplicable delay in the appearance of Ministers before the Select Committee, where, unknown to the general public, evidence is given on oath. The theatrical disclaimers of October 11, which convinced the House of Commons —at any rate for the moment—and the pseudo-Unionist Press, excited the suspicions of detached onlookers as Sir Rufus Isaacs said too little in a meticulously carefully constructed speech, Mr. Herbert Samuel said too much concerning the private affairs of his colleagues, while Mr. Lloyd George was at immense pains to say nothing at all, confining himself to histrionics about "foul lips" with the obvious suggestion of unspotted Ministers. Statements in the House of Commons, especially statements from the Treasury Bench, however solemn in form or authoritative in manner, carry little weight outside nowadays, because the public have been fooled once too often; but even Ministers with a chronic weakness for inaccuracy would hesitate to commit perjury, especially upon matters conceivably known to some outside the inner circle of their immediate confederates.

The rumours of Ministerial speculations in Marconi shares had been so persistent, so positive and widespread as to satisfy any unprejudiced person—and nothing was further from my thoughts until I began studying the subject last July than this Marconi gamble—that there was solid ground for surmising that Ministers had been tempted by the prospect of "unearned increment" and that some had fallen. The same group of Ministers were usually mentioned in these rumours, though I never happened to have heard the Master of Elibank's name in this connection. Again, there seemed to be a general belief that Mr. Herbert Samuel, the Postmaster-General, had not personally participated, even though some of his relations, without his cognisance, might have done so. Rumour has, however, been busy with the name of another prominent Member of the Cabinet, which has so far escaped publicity, and should he now come forward say as a speculator, or rather an "investor," in Spanish Marconis or Canadian Marconis, the Premier, the entire Party, and the Coalition Press would hug him to their bosom as a model of Ministerial correctitude. Neither the *Outlook*, the *National Review*, nor the *New Witness* can be accused of inventing this rumour, for, so far as I know, none of them has given currency to it.

As already stated, Ministers were in a mortal funk in the middle of February, as "the best-laid schemes of mice and men gang aft agley," and the measures adopted to obviate the necessity of any appearance before the Marconi Committee had clearly broken down. But at one moment they were within an ace of success, in which case we should have remained as ignorant of the historic deal in American Marconis as we are of other equally brilliant chapters in the career of the present Cabinet. Mr. W. R. Lawson, who rendered conspicuous public service as the pioneer of the campaign in the *Outlook* (beginning on July 20 last year) which has made history, was unable to take care of himself as a witness or to do justice to his great knowledge of the question. Writing and speaking are two vastly different occupations, just as the tongue and the pen are different organs. Many men who write well—indeed, one might almost say the best writers—are frequently unpractised in the strife of tongues. Being accustomed to express their thoughts at leisure on paper they cannot cope with professional hair-splitters prepared to take any mean advantage. Moreover, Mr. Lawson was fighting under unequal conditions, if while he was being bullied about "rumours" of Ministerial speculations privileged members of the Marconi Committee were aware of actual Ministerial speculations, having been so to speak "tipped the wink," so that they might keep the discussion off dangerous ground and discredit Mr. Lawson at all costs without affording a glimpse of the facts within their knowledge, which would have put a vastly different complexion on the case in Committee. I shall return to this question in its proper place, but need only say here that directly it was seen that Mr. Lawson's tongue was inferior to his pen it was resolved to prolong the agony in order to gain time as Ministerial Micawbers hoped that something might turn up to save their skins, and no less than a fortnight was devoted to this single witness, who was daily bespattered by the mudlarks of the Coalition Press. In him the entire journalistic position was to be shattered. The campaign of the *Outlook* and the *National Review*, to which Mr. Lawson had contributed several illuminating articles—for which I once more take the opportunity of expressing my profound gratitude as they have been so abundantly confirmed by subsequent events, and to-day we can see their author had the

attributes of the seer as well as of the journalist—was to be destroyed in his person.

The editor of the *Outlook* was in a peculiarly difficult position before the Marconi Committee, as there had been no comments in our contemporary on the Marconi question except those of Mr. Lawson, which had been to a large extent withdrawn, and Mr. Oliver (the editor) must be congratulated on the manner in which he acquitted himself in trying circumstances. Mr. Walter Guinness, the proprietor of the *Outlook*, was in an equally difficult position, because he was abroad when Mr. Lawson opened his attack on the Marconi Agreement, and he was no more able than the editor to maintain a position from which his contributor had been manœuvred into withdrawing, but he made the very best of an exceedingly awkward position, and his assailants got very little change out of him. I should have been in a similar quandary but for the fortunate fact that there had been abundant editorial comment in the *National Review*, beginning with the September number (1912), in which attention was for the first time called in " Episodes of the Month " to the Marconi Mystery and salient points of the first *Outlook* article were quoted, while in the same number Major Archer-Shee criticised the Marconi Agreement from the practical standpoint, indicating its preposterous character. This gave me some independent standing-ground ; therefore it was resolved to shut my mouth by consigning me to Holloway, Brixton, or elsewhere, for refusing to accede to impossible demands. The next step would doubtless have been the suppression of Mr. Chesterton by one or other of the modern *lettres de cachet*. Ditto Mr. Hilaire Belloc, or any other witness who had the effrontery to refer to the widespread rumours concerning Ministerial speculations in Marconi shares. After thus comfortably disposing of the journalistic evidence, it might have been intimated to his Majesty's Ministers that as there was nothing left for them to answer there would be no need to trouble them to come before the Committee, and all would have gone as merry as a marriage bell. The Marconi Mystery would have ended in smoke and blue flames, and the great wise and eminent men who adorn the Treasury Bench would have held an even higher place than before in the regard and affections of their credulous countrymen.

IV. THE ACTION AGAINST "LE MATIN"

Unfortunately for the Government, but fortunately for the country, somebody lost his nerve at a critical moment. A curious libel appeared in the *Matin*, as has been stated, on February 14, *i.e.* only two days after the scene before the Marconi Committee. It took a well-edited paper like our Parisian contemporary, which makes a speciality of foreign news, especially English news, forty-eight hours to concoct this precious effusion. What makes the incident even stranger is that the libel actually purported to be an epitome of evidence given by me to the Marconi Committee, to which it bore about as much resemblance as to an article in, let us say, the *Times*. I had never said or thought or dreamt of any of the things fathered upon me by *Le Matin*, and the reproduction of this twaddle would require an apology to the reader were it not for its surprising fruit. Ministers, as we know, had nothing to do with it, as they have said so upon oath, but possibly indiscreet friends may have prompted it as offering a convenient escape from what must now have been recognised as a hopeless impasse. At any rate, whatever may be the explanation here is the *Matin's* ludicrous libel, which could only result in a costly trial to, and a humble apology from, the libellers.

A FINANCIAL SCANDAL IN ENGLAND.

LONDON, FEBRUARY 13.

A very grave scandal occupies the English Press. Some little time ago the English Government signed a contract with the Marconi Company by which that Company bound itself in consideration of a large sum—too large, they tell me—to connect by wireless telegraphy all the British Possessions with the Mother Country. Mr. Leo Maxse, the eminent editor of the *National Review*, protested vehemently against the way in which this agreement had been concluded. He imputed that Mr. Herbert Samuel, the Postmaster-General, whose idea it was to enter into negotiations with the Company, had entered into an arrangement with Sir Rufus Isaacs, Attorney-General, also a member of the Government and brother of Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director of the Marconi Company. All three had bought shares in the Company at an

average price of about 50 francs, at which these shares were quoted before the opening of the negotiations with the Government, and had resold them at a profit rising to as much as 200 francs per share according as the negotiations enabled it to be foreseen that the contract would be concluded. Mr. Maxse attacked at the same time the fact that the contract had been signed in haste on March 7 without having been brought before Parliament, as it ought to have been.

The Coalition Press contemplated the impending *Matin* case with fierce joy, as it would afford a complete and final vindication of all Marconi Ministers—not that any vindication was in the least degree necessary as regards statesmen without a speck upon their escutcheons—and inflict a crushing and humiliating defeat on all evil-minded persons who had polluted the air with baseless Rumour. Much was made of the fact that the plaintiffs, Sir Rufus Isaacs, the Radical Attorney-General, and Mr. Herbert Samuel, the Radical Postmaster-General, had secured the services of such eminent and effective opponents as Sir Edward Carson and Mr. F. E. Smith—who are generally regarded by laymen as sacrificing public interests to professional etiquette in accepting such briefs. Their capture was regarded by the Radicals as a feather in the cap of the Government, as indeed it was. Simpletons were invited to infer that this conjunction of Unionist counsel and Radical plaintiffs showed that no intelligent person could think ill of Ministers in connection with Marconis.

Every effort was made to expedite the action, as it was then eagerly anticipated in Coalition circles that the able lawyer and much-respected man who now holds the office of Lord Chief Justice, Lord Alverstone, was about to relinquish his post through ill-health, and Sir Rufus Isaacs' approaching triumph over the *Matin*, which would be equally a triumph over all his traducers, would open the road to the Lord Chief Justiceship, to which he had already been appointed by premature admirers. Happily Lord Alverstone remains where he was, and that he may long continue to hold the fort is the earnest prayer of all who care about the honour and dignity of the Bench, as in the event of this splendid piece of patronage falling into the hands of the present gang we may be certain that one or other outrageous political job would be perpetrated.

It was likewise announced that the *Matin* would offer no defence of its indefensible and grotesque libel. Consequently

there could be no cross-examination. An early day was fixed, as outraged Cabinet Ministers could not brook for another single moment groundless aspersions on their "personal honour"—a phrase of which we are hearing a great deal too much at the present day from men who, while claiming to be hypersensitive on the subject, are careless custodians of this priceless jewel.

The case was heard by Mr. Justice Darling on March 19, a few days after the opening of a new Session, which had brought a sprinkling of jaded legislators to resume their nauseating parliamentary labours. On the previous day, if I am rightly informed—though I must be careful to add that I am unable to support the Rumour by an affidavit—Radical emissaries were despatched round various newspaper offices to prepare the Press against the shock which might otherwise be caused by the disclosure that in spite of all they had said and had allowed their supporters to say Ministers had speculated in Marconi shares. Probably Unionist editors were appealed to to preserve the good name of England at a moment when her prestige was tottering and to temper the wind of condemnation to the Coneys and the Marconis. *Marconi soit qui mal y pense* became the watchword. Radical editors were presumably reminded that the Coalition was at stake, and that unless all good men and true stood together and swore up to the mark, such great causes as the spoliation of the Welsh Church, the dismemberment of the United Kingdom, the downfall of the British Empire, German Naval Supremacy, the ennoblement of Radical Plutocrats and undesirable aliens, the betrayal of France, Free Imports, &c., would become involved in common ruin. It was hoped to create an atmosphere which might enable the Ministry to claim a triumph with the aid of that portion of the Unionist Press which is only happy either when it is "queering the pitch" for its own Party or helping the Government out of a hole. Happily we have still with us newspapers that cannot be nobbled: the *Morning Post* has immensely increased its great reputation as a national journal by its able and fearless advocacy of the cause of clean Government, to which, taking the London dailies, the *Daily Express*, the *Globe*, and the *Financial News*, have likewise rendered conspicuous service, while an independent Socialist organ, the *Daily Herald*, has shown that there are Socialists,

unlike the Labour Party in Parliament, who are not prepared to approve Ministerial gambling on the Stock Exchange. The weekly Press—the *Outlook*, the *Spectator*, the *Saturday Review*, the *Tablet*, and last, but by no means least, the *Nation*—have all from their different standpoints represented the views of the great body of public opinion which detests the introduction in any shape or form either of Panama Government itself or of the equally sinister preliminaries of Panama Government by which we are threatened.* There are, of course, many other organs too numerous to mention which went right from the outset, though there were some curious defections and some terrible laggards. As most illustrated papers are politically rotten, it is refreshing to observe the vigour and independence of the *Throne*, while our vivacious contemporary, the *New Witness*, has got back a good deal of its own during the last few weeks. Other organs are gradually waking up and will doubtless come into line in time, but a nasty taste was left in the mouth by the comments on the *Matin* case of papers which ought to have known better. One used to be taught that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Nowadays some of us act on the principle that every Englishman's duty should be discharged by somebody else.

The case for the plaintiffs was opened in somewhat humdrum fashion by their leading counsel, whose slipshod brief was presumably furnished by the Post Office, and was in many respects worthy of that Department, which is celebrated for inaccuracy, inconsistency, and ineptitude. Some of the opening statements were curious to the point of challenging attention. In tracing the course of the prolonged negotiations between the Marconi Company and the Post Office, Sir Edward Carson laid special stress on the openness of a transaction upon which there was alleged to have been secrecy.

The moment these negotiations began with the Marconi Company, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director of the Company (who, I may say, had been Managing Director of the Company before his brother, Sir Rufus Isaacs, had ever received office under the Government at all), stated at the meeting of the shareholders as far back as November 11, 1911, that the Government had begun to enter into negotiations with him with a view to this contract. I state that so as to show your Lordship that there is no foundation for suggesting that there was any attempt or any possibility even, having

* The *Stockbroker* has combined humour with finance.

regard to the communications that were made, of people making money on speculations on the Stock Exchange by having information that was not disclosed. The moment the negotiations were entered into the fact was stated by the Managing Director publicly to the shareholders and became public property.

Counsel carefully weigh their words, and if these words are intended to convey anything, as they undoubtedly were, they suggest that the confidential negotiations between the Marconi Company and the Government were carried on *coram populo*, and that no member of the public had any excuse for being ignorant of them. Sir Edward Carson, be it remembered, was not only representing the Postmaster-General, who apparently wishes us to believe that the man in the street was fully apprised of what was going on between him and the Company, but likewise the Attorney-General. If Mr. Lawson should make a slip, or if I made a slip, all the jackals of the Coalition would be in full hue and cry and Grub Street would be ransacked for adequate epithets. I have no intention of criticising counsel, who necessarily speaks from his brief, but what does Sir Rufus Isaacs say to the suggestion that every one was made aware of the Marconi negotiations since November 1911, thanks to the speech of his brother, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director of the Company? Upon no point has Sir Rufus Isaacs been more emphatic or precise, and to none has he attached more importance than to his own entire ignorance of any negotiations whatsoever between the Marconi Company and the Government until March 1912. He told the House of Commons during the notorious Debate of October 11, 1912:

I want to say in reference to myself that I have never, from beginning to end, in any shape or form, either by deed, act, or word, or anything else, taken part in the negotiations in reference to this company. I never have discussed, from beginning to end, the making of this contract with my right hon. friend the Postmaster-General, and I never knew there was such a contract in contemplation until a few days before, when I was told at a private social function by the Managing Director of the Company, who is my brother, that he did hope to get a contract with the Government, and was in negotiation with them for it. That was a few days before I saw the announcement in the papers that there had, in fact, been a contract accepted.

Sir Rufus Isaacs repeated this statement in Court and reiterated it in his evidence in chief before the Marconi Committee on March 25, 1913, in replying to a question of the Chairman:

Q. And you have not taken any part in advising on the agreement? *A.* No, the matter never came before me at all, and I had nothing whatever to do with it. In fact, I should like to say that I knew nothing of it until just a little before the contract was announced in the papers, when I did hear from my brother at a family function that he expected to get a contract. That was a few days—I rather think it was the Sunday—just before the announcement of the contract. The next I knew of it was the announcement in the Press, when I saw that the tender had been accepted—there may have been more, but that is all that impressed me. I saw that he had got what he expected. That is the beginning and end of my knowledge of any sort as to the contract.

I would not for a moment dispute these assertions, but one is entitled to ask whether it is fair that the Court should be told that everything was so open that the general public were aware of what the brother of the Managing Director of the Marconi Company was totally ignorant of until several months afterwards? Speaking as one of the general public I had no knowledge whatsoever of any negotiations for a wireless telegraphy agreement between the Marconi Company and the British Post Office in November 1911, and like others I remained in ignorance of the fact for many months after it was known to Sir Rufus Isaacs as the resources of the Government were strained to prevent Parliament and the general public—which is a different world from the financial world—from knowing anything about these negotiations. This is a fair sample of the statements put forward by or on behalf of Ministers throughout this controversy. They should make one doubly cautious, and indeed suspicious, in scrutinising every explanation of the many inexplicable incidents in *l'affaire Marconi.*

Again Sir Edward Carson, who, let me repeat, bears no responsibility for his brief, informed the Court, in emphasising the publicity attending the Marconi negotiations:

It (*i.e.* the contract) was not signed in haste at all. It had been signed after all the negotiations I have stated, and the absolutely usual precedent was performed of having a completed contract first signed and then placed before the House of Commons. When this was accepted on March 7 every paper in the United Kingdom published either the day after or a day or two afterwards not only the fact of the contract, but most of the terms of it, and also published the fact that the contract could not become a binding contract until it had been ratified by Parliament, and the circular sent out by the Marconi Company themselves makes the very same statement.

The reader might gather from this assertion of the plaintiffs' counsel that on the signature of the agreement on March 7

the Government, or the Post Office on behalf of the Government, had issued an official statement to the Press announcing the fact and informing the public generally of its terms. Critics of the Government have always maintained that this course should have been adopted, and much of the trouble arises from its not having been adopted. The Post Office preferred to shroud itself in mystery for several weeks, and flatly declined to make any announcement whatsoever, though the Postmaster was continually pressed for information in the House of Commons. On one pretext or another he steadily refused. His offence consists in having stood aside and allowed the Marconi Company to exploit their agreement for their own purposes in a circular to their shareholders, which no doubt attained some publicity, though to nothing approaching the extent suggested erroneously by Sir Edward Carson. Moreover, if there be anything in subsequent contentions of the Post Office, this Marconi circular was misleading in material particulars. By his childish secretiveness Mr. Herbert Samuel became largely responsible for the huge Stock Exchange gamble, which went on under his nose in various Marconi Companies, which, as we now know, proved too much for certain of his own colleagues in the Ministry. When his attention was called to the speculation in Marconi shares he became the superior person. On August 1 (1912) Mr. J. Ward, a Labour Member, addressed the following question to the Postmaster-General: "Will the right hon. gentleman give the prices of the shares of the Marconi Company before the tender was accepted and the prices after it was known that the contract was sealed?" To which Mr. Herbert Samuel replied: "I have no concern with the prices of the Company's shares either before the tender was accepted or immediately after or now."

Nowadays Ministers are extremely sensitive on the subject of Rumours, but this reply to Mr. Ward shows that Mr. Samuel did not care a brass farthing whether or not a huge Stock Exchange gamble should coincide with secret and confidential negotiations (*pace* Sir Edward Carson) between the Marconi Company and the Government, from which several Marconi Companies, probably all Marconi Companies, parent and offspring, stood to gain.

Mr. Samuel's attitude undoubtedly stimulated the "idle

gossip" about which Ministers and their henchmen now complain, and they should thank the Postmaster-General instead of slanging journalists who have merely done their duty in calling attention to matters of public notoriety founded on facts which were challenged, although they were known by the chief challengers to be unchallengeable.

In endeavouring to account for the failure of his clients (the Attorney-General and the Postmaster-General) to appear before the Marconi Select Committee and tender the evidence which an expectant public had so long awaited, counsel made a somewhat significant remark which tends to corroborate a suggestion on a previous page. After referring to the appointment of the Committee last Session and its reappointment this Session, Sir Edward Carson added :

> It is right that I should say that the Postmaster General and the Attorney-General intimated at once their desire to go before this Committee, and they were told that they would be summoned before the Committee when the proper time came. They have not yet been summoned before the Committee, and one can easily see that probably the reason is that as people are formulating, or are attempting to formulate, some kind of charges, the Committee are probably waiting until these charges are formulated before they call upon these two Ministers. But, my Lord, I desire to state they were both anxious at the earliest moment, and intimated that they were prepared at any moment to attend the Committee when they were summoned.

Is not the plain meaning of this that should the journalists "attempting to formulate some kind of charges" before the Marconi Committee fail or be suppressed it would probably be decided by a "majority" of the Committee that there was no necessity to waste the time of Ministers by asking them to answer a case which had collapsed? Unless it means this it means nothing. We are told in terms that Ministers were awaiting the conclusion of the journalists' evidence. Should this be swept aside *ex hypothesi* the Committee, which had arranged its procedure so that journalists should precede Ministers and Ministers succeed journalists, would intimate to the latter that there was nothing for them to deal with as their "personal honour" was unaffected by the groundless gossip of rancorous pens or rancorous tongues.

The action against *Le Matin* was decidedly interesting. It had been open to Ministers ever since October 29, when the

Marconi Select Committee was constituted, to demand that precedence should be given to them over the futile evidence of the Post Office, upon which the early winter months were wasted, in order that they might clear the air by destroying the rumours. After wasting months and stimulating Rumour they adopted an alternative which, to put it mildly, was expensive, even if the *Matin* pays up the full amount of party and party costs. Again, if the Committee were bound to wait until journalistic witnesses had formulated charges that required answering, why have they suddenly abandoned the journalistic evidence after the *Matin* case in order to hear Ministers against whom *ex hypothesi* there was no case. Journalists have failed to "formulate" any charges. No one attempts to explain these mysteries. The action of the *Matin* appeared to afford a convenient peg whereby to break to the people the fact, which it had become dangerous to delay, that during the negotiations between the British Marconi Company and the Government, the Attorney-General, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Chief Whip of the Radical Party, had so far forgotten themselves as to embark upon substantial speculations in one of the associated Marconi Companies on the strength of information supplied by the Managing Director of the parent Marconi Company, who was actually conducting the negotiations with the Government.

After disposing of the rubbish published by *Le Matin* to the effect that there had been a corrupt conspiracy between the Attorney-General and the Postmaster-General to buy shares in the contracting Company at £2 and sell them at £8 on the announcement of the contract, Sir Edward Carson, like the great advocate he is, especially when there is an unusually difficult piece of business on hand, casually referred to "other Marconi Companies." There was a Canadian Marconi Company and a Spanish Marconi Company,

And although what I have said up to this entirely completes the matter as regards the proof of the falsehood of these statements, I must, my Lord, having regard to one transaction in one of the Companies by the Attorney-General which it is necessary to explain, ask an indulgence, although it is a little outside the libel, so that there may be no confusion with reference to the matter in stating something about these other companies. The other Companies were the Canadian and Spanish Companies. The shares of those two Companies were being dealt with on the Stock Exchange here some

time during that year, 1911 or 1912—I am not sure of the dates—and I think they were the only ones as regards these Companies or as regards any other Company.

The Postmaster-General had never had any share at any time in any of them, directly or indirectly. "As regards these Companies, up to March 7, the date that the tender was accepted, Sir Rufus Isaacs, the Attorney-General, had never had any dealing in any of them." It was an exciting moment in Court when counsel added: "The American Company, in which he had a subsequent dealing which I am going to state, which is an independent Company, which could have no interest and has no interest in the contract at all, which merely erects these stations in America, which has no interest in the profits of the English Company, although the English Company has shares in it, subsequent to the acceptance of the tender proceeded to raise capital, having bought out certain interests in America, and made other arrangements there which required an extension of their capital." Sir Edward Carson added: "Even the suggestion of issuing shares did not come until a considerable time, some weeks, after the tender had been accepted in the English Company."

The reader, who is likely to have a sickener of this "six weeks" before he has done with it, will instantly enquire, "*If the American Marconi Company 'could have no interest and has no interest in the contract at all' between the English Marconi Company and the British Government, what does it matter whether Sir Rufus Isaacs bought his American shares six weeks after the announcement of that contract or six weeks before?*" These things have no relation, but astute men in a tight place almost invariably overlook the obvious and the elementary. This "six weeks" has been dinned into us and will be dinned into us throughout this controversy, and yet *ex hypothesi*, accepting the version of the Attorney-General, it is wholly irrelevant unless the American Marconi Company, contrary to the view presented by those who speculated in it, did, as a matter of fact, derive material advantage, if indeed it did not largely owe its reorganisation, to the triumph of the parent Marconi Company over the British Post Office as embodied in the agreement of March 7.

However, Ministers have chosen to take their stand on this "six weeks," and if they insist on emphasising its importance

there can be no possible objection in humouring them by adopting their suicidal suggestion.

Sir Edward Carson continued: "Six weeks after the tender had been made public"—but as the reader will bear in mind only by the English Marconi Company, the other party to the transaction, the Post Office remaining impenetrably "mum"—"the Attorney-General having heard of this American Company and of their shares—having heard of it, I think, for the first time a few days before—bought 10,000 of these shares at a premium, which was the market price. There is one observation I desire to make. I have made perfectly clear the time at which what was done, which could have no reference whatsoever to the tender we have been talking about, and no reference whatsoever to the Marconi Company that were dealing with the Government, I mean it being an entirely different Company." Then came another point upon which singular stress has been laid, though it is equally unintelligible to simpletons like ourselves, viz. that at the moment the Attorney-General bought these 10,000 shares in the American Marconi Company then at the commencement of its boom British Marconi shares were at the top of their boom or, as counsel expressed it, "were up at the very highest figures that they had reached, so that any suggestion that the purchase of the American shares had anything to do with the price of these shares is entirely out of the question, because he (Sir Rufus Isaacs) had the good or the bad fortune—it does not matter which so far as this is concerned—to buy these American shares at the time the British shares had reached the very highest point."

What can this mean? Has any one ever suggested that the Attorney-General or any other Minister bought British Marconi shares at the top price? Is there any merit in abstaining from doing so? Would any one but a fool have thought of it? The wise man sells shares when they are high and buys shares when they are low. This is precisely what the Attorney-General, like any other speculator, would do on the strength of special information. He bought his Americans cheap at the time the British shares were absurdly dear and when many people were moving their money from one gamble to the other. No one has yet established any relation between the facts cited by Sir Edward

Carson, and as the Companies were alleged to be completely independent how could there be any connection between the prices of their shares? Counsel startled the Court by adding that the Attorney-General had made a loss on this purchase of 10,000 shares—then came the portentous observation: "He sold some of the shares, and amongst others he sold 1000 to Mr. Lloyd George, and another 1000 to the Master of Elibank, who is now Lord Murray, but who was then the Master of Elibank, who are two intimate friends of his own, and it is right to say that it was he who offered them the shares. . . . I am afraid it also turned out a loss for them, but at all events as regards the Attorney-General, having sold those and some other shares, some of them at a profit, the net result is that he (Sir Rufus Isaacs) has still 6400 of the shares, and, taking the present price, he is a loser on the whole transaction of about £1000 to £1500." As this is regarded as another "bull point" in the Ministerial case it is worth interjecting that the money remained in the Isaacs family, which made at least £6000 on this one transaction. Nothing was said in the *Matin* case as to the purchase price of the shares, as it was doubtless not deemed good for the public digestion to have more than homeopathic doses of Ministerial revelations. But emphasis was laid on the fact

That as regards his sales of some of these shares, they were done in the ordinary way by brokers on the Stock Exchange; there was no secrecy of any kind, nor was there any reason to have any secrecy. It passed through the books of these brokers, through their clerks and everybody else,* and really the matter is so removed from the charges made in that libel that I only go into in at all—because of course it could be no justification for any statement in the libel—because of the position of the Attorney-General and because he wishes in the fullest way to state this deal, so that it may not be said that he keeps anything whatsoever back. My Lord, that is the whole matter.

So it was "the whole matter" in the *Matin* case (though it was not a full disclosure of Ministerial transactions in Marconi shares). One is simply lost in amazement that it should have been dragged by the heels into the action against *Le Matin* which had never directly or indirectly made any allusion whatsoever to any possible gambles in which Ministers might have innocently indulged in Marconi Companies generally. Its

* I feel it almost a reproach that so notorious a transaction was not duly recorded among the "Episodes of the Month" in the *National Review* of May 1912.

absurd accusations were strictly limited to the British Marconi Company—and the contract in which the American Company had no conceivable interest. This American deal was therefore *ex hypothesi* as irrelevant as it was proper. What had it to do with the case before Mr. Justice Darling? Again, if the Attorney-General and his co-speculators were so desperately anxious to take the country into their confidence as to any gambles they might have had in other Marconi shares, even in the shares of a Marconi Company so remote from the British Company as the American Company, in the name of all that is conceivable why did they not inform the House of Commons on October 11, when there was a general Debate on the question and the subject would have been absolutely relevant, or they might have stepped up to Committee Room Number 12, where a Select Committee had been sitting three times most weeks since the end of October—wasting an enormous amount of time on futilities while Ministers were stoically enduring martyrdom through rumours affecting their "personal honour," which they could at any moment have dissipated on their own showing because, though the British Marconi Company may be interested in the American Marconi Company, the American Company, although described as an "associated" Company by the parent Company, is an undutiful offspring, without interest in its parent. For a moment, though only for a moment, one wondered whether the American Marconi Company knew its own mother. . .

V. DIVERGENT PLAINTIFFS

It is unnecessary to dwell at any great length upon the evidence of Mr. Herbert Samuel in *Le Matin* action, as he was content to play second fiddle, and his name is not associated with any Marconi gambles, though his part in the affair is no less pitiable than that of his more speculative colleagues. It was amusing to watch his unavailing struggles with the difficulties in which he has involved the latter by his gratuitous concealment of the terms of the Marconi Agreement from the House of Commons from March 7 to July on the specific ground that the contract was not sufficiently completed to warrant a full statement. This completely knocks the bottom out of the Gamblers' case. Mr. Asquith, who, as might have been expected, has identified himself with the Marconi speculators, and the rest of the Cabinet who say ditto ditto, are impaled on one or other horn of a dilemma of which they are welcome to take their choice. Either the Marconi contract was substantially completed on March 7—a fact on which Sir Rufus Isaacs stakes his reputation and political existence—in which case concealment of its terms by the Government while a huge gamble took place in the shares of the various associated Companies, from which insiders made fortunes while outsiders were fleeced—demands impeachment; or alternatively, the contract being conditional was the subject of serious negotiations between the various Government Departments concerned, and for Ministers to gamble or "invest" in any of the "associated" Companies before July 19, when the contract was signed, is conduct that speaks for itself. That they were and are unable to appreciate the impropriety of speculating in Marconis before the agreement had been ratified by Parliament shows the progressive deterioration of public life. On October 11 the Postmaster-General had no suspicion of a shadow of doubt as to what had happened in March, as may be gathered

from the following interchange of views with a member of the Liberal Party—Sir Henry Norman, who, in opening the Debate, said:

On March 7, the Postmaster-General signed an agreement with Marconi's Wireless Company for the erection of six wireless stations.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: There is no agreement.

SIR H. NORMAN: I will adopt whatever word the Postmaster-General chooses. He approved and signed a contract.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: No, sir. I signed no contract. The Marconi Company put in a tender in general terms. A letter was written by the Post Office accepting the tender upon which a contract was subsequently to be based.

SIR H. NORMAN: I will make myself entirely safe by saying that the Postmaster-General signed a document.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: Somebody wrote a letter.

SIR H. NORMAN: Really, if I may respectfully say so, that is rather a quibble. Some document committing the Post Office and therefore the British Government to the erection of these wireless stations, subject to the ratification of this House, was signed by somebody on March 7, on behalf of the Postmaster-General.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: There was no contract.

In the course of his elaborate speech winding up the debate Mr. Herbert Samuel informed the House of Commons:

On March 7, what had happened was this: The Company, after these long negotiations, put in a brief formal tender, giving the figures, years, and so forth. Other matters were to be left open for further and detailed examination by the Departments of the Governments concerned, by the engineers, and by us. I confess that it never occurred to my mind that I ought to lay that letter of the Company and our letter in reply uponthe table of the House. It was not a contract—it was merely the acceptance of a preliminary tender. No one in my Department, or out of it, ever suggested to me that a paper of that sort should be laid upon the table of the House. I doubt if there is any precedent for laying the acceptance of a tender, apart from the contract, which is based upon it.

A little later in the only famous speech ever delivered by the Postmaster-General or ever likely to be delivered by him came the following::

Much to my regret, it was not until July that the contract (*i.e.* with the Marconi Company) was completed. Although personally I pressed it forward as much as I could, the various Departments could not come to terms with themselves or with the Company on the outstanding parts. But the day the contract was signed, it was laid on the table of the House.

Quite so. That day was July 19.

So much for the suggestion that the "contract" (the Attorney-General's word) had been announced to the world in March. A

version of it, which the Post Office is understood to repudiate, appeared in the circular issued by the Marconi Company to its shareholders and came before the special public which reads financial intelligence—a very different body from the general public. Parliament was kept in the dark. In this same Debate of October 11, the Attorney-General, for reasons now fairly obvious, emphasised the fact, and his divergence from Mr. Samuel excited comment at the time and ever since, "that the contract had been got," *i.e.* by the agreement of March 7. And now we have the "six weeks" theory.

The Coalition to-day are a unit in adopting the Attorney-General's view, which is indeed vital to the existence of the Cabinet, and ingenuously enquire: "What possible objection can the most fastidious purist urge against a Ministerial speculation in Marconi shares six weeks after the Government contract was got?" To which, as already pointed out, one among many answers may take the form of a question: "Why should not Ministers have speculated in American Marconi shares six weeks *before* the Government contract had been 'got,' seeing that the American Company had no vestige of interest in that contract or in the company negotiating it—beyond being its offspring?"

Mr. Samuel, whose supercilious conceit is largely responsible for the misfortunes of the Ministry—which are only just beginning—because there are Spanish Marconi Companies, Canadian Marconi Companies, &c., which have all had their booms and their temptations—tried to have the best of both worlds before Mr. Justice Darling. The reader should carefully compare his statements in Court with those he had made in the House of Commons and ask themselves whether they are reconcilable, or on the other hand whether the parliamentary statement was calculated to convey one impression and the evidence another.

MR. F. E. SMITH: You have told me that that tender was sent in by the Company on February 13, 1912. When was that tender answered? *A.* There were negotiations proceeding on certain points, and various modifications were arranged in the clauses of the tender, and it was accepted on March 7 by a letter which was sent by the Secretary to the Post Office, with the approval of myself and also with the approval of the Treasury, to the Company, showing that they accepted this tender.

Q. When the letter of March 7, of which you have spoken was sent, was the matter made public or not? *A.* Yes, it was at once made public in the Press.

Q. It was published in every paper? *A.* Yes, it was well known.

Q. The letter saying that the tender had been accepted subject to certain specified modifications? *A.* Yes.

Surely this implied that what Mr. Samuel told the House of Commons was impossible had actually been done, namely the publication in March of the official acceptance of the tender. Mr. Samuel appears to have realised this, and the subject was left more obscure by his next answer:

Q. You have told me that the contract was signed on July 19, 1912, and I will ask you a general question on this: Was the course that was pursued in every respect consistent with the whole trend of Parliamentary precedent construed most strictly? *A.* Precisely, it was absolutely in accordance with all previous precedents relating to Post Office contracts. Indeed, it would have been contrary to all precedent, and I am not at all sure that it would have been in order, to have presented the tender and the letter accepting the tender to Parliament in lieu of the contract itself.

The contrast between the irresistible Postmaster-General, who dominated the Debate of October 11, provoking uproarious enthusiasm in the Coalition Press, and the oppressed witness in the *Matin* case was somewhat striking. The omnipotent one it appears was far less omnipotent than the House of Commons, where he rides the whirlwind and directs the storm, had been given to understand. As he informed the Court: "I, personally, was exceedingly anxious that the contract should come before the House at the earliest possible moment after July 19, and pressed for it on several occasions." But without success. The competition of other business defeated the pious aspirations of Mr. Herbert Samuel. As we shall see however later on he tried to get the contract through without serious discussion.

The Postmaster-General had something to say suggestive about the Select Committee supporting the theory propounded on a previous page and to some extent confirmed in Sir Edward Carson's speech. Mr. F. E. Smith (one of Mr. Herbert Samuel's Counsel), asked him in referring to the Marconi Committee: "I think you indicated at a very early stage your willingness, and, indeed, your desire to go before the Committee at any moment which, with regard to the order of discussions, might be convenient." To which the Postmaster-General replied, and his reply is worthy of microscopic scrutiny: "Yes, certainly, but I was given to understand by the Chairman of the Committee that the Committee had considered their own procedure, and

that they had decided that they would prefer to hear first any persons who might desire to make charges against members of the Government, and to call members of the Government, *so far as necessary* [my italics] to rebut any charges that might be made." Quite so, if the journalistic witnesses could be disposed of there would be no need whatsoever to summon Ministers, and the public might have been indefinitely denied the interesting "American" revelations which Ministers claim credit for "volunteering" though "like the flowers that bloom in the spring tra la they've nothing to do with the case." Mr. Samuel had also to get over the awkward fact that he had already appeared before the Committee. It would, of course, have been perfectly easy for Mr. Herbert Samuel when once before the Select Committee to explain that he thought it only right so that there might be no misunderstanding or circulation of superfluous rumours concerning Ministers, to inform his auditors that owing to an unfortunate oversight during the Debate of October 11 some of his colleagues, contrary to the impression conveyed to the House of Commons and the country, had indulged in substantial speculations in Marconi shares before the signature of the Contract, though doubtless the Select Committee would regard the matter as totally irrelevant to their enquiry, because the particular Company in which the "investments" had been made was so detached from the Company with which he had negotiated, even though the Managing Director of the one sat on the boards of both, that the matter was perhaps hardly worth mentioning, and he only referred to it because Ministers were burning to get it "off their chest." The fact that the Postmaster-General had already appeared before the Select Committee was thus glozed over in the Matin case.

Q. Just for clearness, I think you went before the Committee on some technical point only. *A.* Yes, some subordinate point.

"Subordinate" is good in this connection, seeing that the subject was the appointment of a really independent and therefore non-official Committee of experts to ascertain the best wireless system, which the Postmaster-General unsuccessfully opposed.

He could not be cross-examined because the defendants had decided to withdraw and apologise, but the reader may be disposed to regard it as singularly unfortunate that Mr. Samuel

should not have confined himself when speaking in the Marconi Debate in the House of Commons of October 11 to the disclaimer of speculation in Marconi Companies limited to himself and his family, he gave on oath six months afterwards, because if he is capable of serious reflection he must realise that his declaration in Parliament, where he explicitly spoke on behalf of all his colleagues as well as himself, was calculated to mislead the country into believing that Ministers had participated in none of the many gambles in Marconi shares. There were no distinctions drawn in those days between one company and another ompany, and the public missed the point of the emphasis laid on the words "this Company" by the Postmaster-General and the Attorney-General in the House of Commons. It is appropriate here to recall the *verba ipsissima* of Mr. Herbert Samuel during that Debate.

I confess that, after reading for months past allegations, insinuations, attacks, accusations of maladministration and favouritism, and even worse, it is to me a profound relief now to be able to stand at this table in the light of day, and give an answer to these assertions. I should like, in the first instance, to confirm, in unqualified terms, what has been said on his own behalf by my right hon. and learned friend the Attorney-General (Sir Rufus Isaacs) and I can do it not only on my behalf, but on that of every member of the Cabinet. I say that these stories that members of the Cabinet, knowing the contract was in contemplation, and feeling that possibly the prices of shares might rise themselves, directly or indirectly, bought any of those shares, or took any interest in this Company through any other party * whatever, have not one syllable of truth in them. Neither I myself nor any of my colleagues have at any time held one shilling's worth of shares in this Company, directly or indirectly, or have derived one penny profit from the fluctuations in their prices. It seems shameful that political feeling can carry so far, that lying tongues can be found to speak and ears found to listen to such wicked and utterly baseless slanders such as these. This Committee (*i.e.* the Marconi Committee) which will be appointed will enquire into every aspect of this question, and members of the Government will be most ready to appear before it. Every member of the House may have full confidence that while every part of this transaction will come under the searchlight of examination, it will be shown that there is no uncleanliness in any quarter.

---

* In the daily Official Report, the words "through any other party" are replaced by the words "or in any part of it," which make more sense and convey a totally different meaning. The bound official reports, which are understood to be edited by speakers, give the version quoted above as do the newspapers I have examined, but if a careful official reporter misheard these words so might members of Parliament, and as a reader of the daily Report this was the only version known to me.

While on the subject of disclaimers it may be as well to reproduce the equally famous declarations of Sir Rufus Isaacs on the same occasion:

Let me go to the next charge, which is, I think, a worse charge. It is that some member of the Government not named, but hinted at—some member or members of the Cabinet—knowing that these negotiations were taking place, knowing that there was a contract in contemplation, and thinking the shares would go up when the announcement of the contract came to be made—the price of the shares being then 14s. or 15s. and eventually rose to £9 after the announcement of the contract was made—thereupon, and in consequence of the information which some member of the Government had got, bought shares in this Company at a low price, in order to sell them at the higher price when the contract was announced. I desire to say frankly, on behalf of myself that that is absolutely untrue. Never from the beginning, when the shares were 14s. or £9, have I had one single transaction with the shares of that Company. I am not only speaking for myself, but I am also speaking on behalf, I know, of both my right hon. friend the Postmaster-General, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, in some way or other, in some of the articles, have been brought into this matter.

As the *Nation* acknowledges, these disclaimers were understood by the general public as covering any transactions by any Ministers in any Marconi Companies. The readers of the *National Review* had special reasons for thus construing Ministerial declarations, because the October (1912) number of the *National Review* contained the first of Mr. Lawson's Marconi articles, which was obviously in the minds of Ministers. It was published about ten days before the Debate and at the close of a long review of the relations between the Marconi Company and the Post Office, Mr. Lawson called special attention to the American Marconi Company in a striking passage which, though vehement and scathing, was severely left alone by the craftier—or shall I say "better informed"—of his cross-examiners during his fortnight's ordeal before the Marconi Committee.

Mother Marconi has been a prolific parent and her chickens are spread all over the globe. They have assumed half a dozen different nationalities—French, Spanish, Russian, American, Canadian and English. But only two of them are as yet sufficiently developed to deserve a place on the Official List of the London Stock Exchange. These are the American and Canadian companies, both of which have shared with their spectacular parent the honours—and profits—of the recent bull campaign.

The mother company held last December 564,855 shares ($5) in the Canadian concern and 34,174 in the American one. The latter holding has, however, been largely increased since, thanks to the brilliant coup executed by Mr. Marconi and Mr. Godfrey Isaacs last spring. The directors of their principal American rival had shortly before

been sent to gaol for fraud in connection with the capitalisation of the United Wireless Company. They had distributed three million dollars of paper in a very short time and then gone into liquidation. Mr. Isaacs arranged with the liquidators to wipe out their derelict stock and then promptly created seven million dollars of American Marconi shares in its place! . . .

The result was a South Sea bubble mania on a small scale. The coup was so skilfully boomed that both Wall Street and Capel Court literally lost their heads over it. One fine morning in April—it was the 19th, a few days after the *Titanic* disaster—dealings were started in the new American Marconis. The five-dollar or £1 shares were bid for up to £4, and thousands of shares were bought at that figure. Orders came rushing in from Ireland and the provinces to buy lines of 10,000, 20,000, and as high as 50,000 shares in a line. Fortunately all the London brokers were not so mad as their clients. They either cut down the orders to what they considered safe amounts or declined them altogether. By doing so they saved many a foolish plunger from absolute ruin, as before the end of the day the shares had flopped to 50s. or even less.

The Stock Exchange had witnessed nothing so disgraceful since the similar coup performed by Mr. Barney Barnato nearly twenty years ago. When that neck or nothing speculator capitalised himself under the name of the Barnato Consolidated Company his shares also went up like a rocket. The first morning that they were dealt in an enthusiastic crowd scrambled for them at £4—the same topnote on which American Marconis started. "Barneys" alias "Johnnies" have since been down to 17s. and American Marconis were within two months of their début as low as 30s.

If the starting price of £4 a share could have been maintained the market valuation of the American Marconi Company would have been forty million dollars. Dividends on forty million dollars would have had to be earned in order to justify such a market price. That could only have been done by establishing as absolute a monopoly of wireless telegraphy in the United States as the Marconi Company are trying, with the help of certain Cabinet Ministers, to create in the United Kingdom. Only a nation of "the biggest fools on earth" could put itself at the mercy of such a voracious clique of patent exploiters and monopolisers. The Marconi Ring apparently hope to make as much out of wireless telegraphy as Mr. Andrew Carnegie got out of the steel tariff, but the day is past for high game like that.

It may amuse non-speculative as well as speculative readers to trace the sympathetic movements of the share market and the Imperial wireless negotiations during the past twelve months. . . .

Such is the sordid story of the Marconi scandal of 1912. In a small way it has been a repetition of the South Sea bubble. Ministers implicated in the South Sea bubble were impeached and severely punished. What is to happen to Ministers who directly or indirectly may have been responsible for the Marconi scandal? Further, what is to be done to prevent polygot riggers of Marconi shares realising their impudent ambition to monopolise all the wireless telegraphy of the British Empire *and the United States?* (my italics).

Mr. Lawson's article closed as follows:

For this sardonic Treasury Minute (defending the Marconi contract) the Chancellor of the Exchequer is of course officially responsible. It will therefore be necessary

for the proposed Committee of Enquiry to have him before it. He will naturally be anxious to tell it all he knows about the wireless mystery. Altogether three members of the Government have figured more or less in this suspicious episode—the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Attorney-General, and the Postmaster-General. What have they to say to the unflattering comments that are being made on their conduct as public trustees?

I apologise for the frequent reference to the *National Review*. It would be infinitely easier for me to tell the story if distinguished contemporaries, for example, the *Fortnightly Review* or the *Nineteenth Century*, had made the Marconi Mystery their own, but it happens to have been the *National Review* which appreciated the value and importance of Mr. Lawson's articles in the *Outlook*—of which the first was published on July 20, 1912—and followed up his campaign. Moreover, the Coalition Press, as has been shown in previous pages, has continually and vociferously challenged the editor of the *National Review* on this question. It is therefore necessary to insist that we (*i.e.* Mr. Lawson and I), and the same observation applies to the *Outlook*, never went "nap" on a single Marconi Company for the simple reason that the Marconi Companies form one group bearing a common name, controlled by the same people, to a large extent organised, financed, and managed from London, and all alike animated by the common aspiration of acquiring a world-wide monopoly of wireless telegraphy, which would probably be as bad for the world as it would be injurious to the cause of scientific development. If ever there was an intimate financial family it was Mother Marconi and her numerous offspring. To-day we are invited to believe in order that the skins of certain prominent politicians may be saved that in this particular family the mother had a stake in the prosperity of the children, while the children had no stake whatsoever in the prosperity of their mother. It is admitted that the enrichment of the off-shoots nourished the parent stem—it could hardly be denied seeing the extent to which she lives on them—but it has become treason to suggest, it is *lèse-majesté*, against Chancellors of the Exchequer, Attorneys-General, Chief Whips, and Heaven knows what other Ministers beside—as we are far from the end of the chapter—to insinuate that the fortunes of the parent Marconi Company can possibly affect the children by a red cent.

The British Marconi Company might have the British Post Office even more completely in its grip than under the preposterous "agreement" which was not an agreement, or "contract" which was not a contract; it might get 15 per cent. in lieu of the proposed 10 per cent. on gross receipts, or 20 per cent., or even 50 per cent., from the philanthropists of the Post Office; it might secure everything it asked for in its most voracious moments and a great deal more without conferring one iota of benefit on its detached kinsmen in different parts of the world. Not being a financier or a Minister who has been found out, or a journalist whose sole business consists in preventing Ministers from paying the consequences of their folly, I am as a little child in such matters, cherishing the child-like view that under no conceivable circumstances should British Cabinet Ministers, whom we unfortunate taxpayers pay from £5000 to £12,000 per annum to look after our affairs, participate in any Stock Exchange gambles, even though they may rechristen them "investments." The Marconi Companies are united by such strong and close ties of persons and policy as to be, what they officially describe themselves, "associated" companies, and an "investor" in one is necessarily interested in others; therefore to unsophisticated persons like myself and the reader there is no serious difference between buying British Marconis and buying American, Spanish, Canadian or other Marconis; that for members of a Government engaged in negotiations with a Marconi Company, of which the Government necessarily had inside knowledge before those negotiations were completed and the contract signed and published, was a grossly improper proceeding; all the more as apart from official knowledge of what was going on behind the scenes before the contract was finally licked into shape they received a "tip" immediately convertible into cash from the Managing Director of *the* Marconi Company personally negotiating with the British Government.

If such things are done in the green tree, how will it be in the dry? If this be permissible, pardonable, and proper, almost anything is permissible, pardonable, and proper to British Cabinet Ministers, and we may as well call our country "Panama" without further ado, because if "Panama" has not actually

arrived it is on the high road. "Personal honour," if we may judge by their declamation, is the animating object of Ministerial existence, but the time may come when Ministers are insensitive on such matters, and men less fastidious than Sir Rufus Isaacs, less puritanical than Mr. Lloyd George, less sagacious than the Master of Elibank, may be tempted to do things, and certainly will do things, which the Isaacs, the Georges, and the Elibanks, and their supporters in Parliament and the Press denounce as "corruption." After all, we are getting on towards the downward path. Marconi Companies at no time during the last three years have been suitable investments for British Ministers. This would be as universally recognised to-day by the Radical Press as it was yesterday, and as it would be to-morrow, if the parts were reversed and the Ministers involved happened to be members of a Unionist Government. But as it is the fortunes of a Party great in numbers, though sadly diminished in popularity and prestige, are bound up with the fate of the gamblers who confessed at the twelfth hour. Sir Rufus Isaacs himself had glimmerings of the impropriety of speculating in Marconis, but having capitulated, and having made a hideous blunder, he evidently resolved to postpone making a clean breast of it—in which, as we now know, he was encouraged by the Prime Minister—hoping against hope that the transaction might remain in happy oblivion. Unfortunately, when ultimately he screwed himself to the sticking-point, he had not the requisite courage to cry *peccavi*, but with his colleague of the Exchequer tried to brazen the thing out, and as a consequence plunged deeper into the morass of flimsy pretexts, trumpery distinctions, pitiful hair-splitting and impossible inconsistencies. The Attorney-General has devoted his brilliant talents for a quarter of a century to turning witnesses inside out—which is described by those who dislike the process as a species of moral "torture"—but the art of the cross-examiner is vastly different from that of the cross-examinee. Happily for him, he began disclosing where there could be no cross-examination, as the defendant newspaper *Le Matin* had withdrawn from an impossible position.

VI. COALITION VOLTE-FACE

The reader will fail to appreciate the consternation caused by Sir Rufus Isaacs' preliminary confession unless he appreciates the atmosphere created at the moment by the savage enthusiasm of the Ministerial Press. These ferocious organs had daily declared day in day out that no language could express the enormity of the offence committed by persons who mentioned the rumours averring speculation by Ministers in Marconi shares. Quotations from leading Radical journals in the middle of February are given on previous pages. It will be generally agreed, for the simple reason that it cannot be contested, that there is nothing wicked or malignant in repeating harmless rumours even about Mr. Asquith's colleagues. Therefore *ex hypothesi* for Ministers to speculate in Marconi shares—with which the rumours were alone concerned—must be an unspeakable offence—infinitely worse than the circulation of rumours which have proved themselves to be true. It would be a tremendous shock to those who had staked their reputation on the mendacity of the rumour-mongers and the veracity of Ministers to find that the former were right and themselves mere dupes who had been deceived by the earnest and indignant declarations of the Attorney-General, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Postmaster-General in the House of Commons last October. Emissaries were accordingly deputed to "prepare" the Press for a disagreeable surprise, and doubtless to indicate the line of retreat. But the general public, which is studiously kept in the dark, were nevertheless thunderstruck by the preliminary revelations in the *Matin* case—incomplete as they proved to be, and strenuous as were the efforts of "Hush Up" newspapers of all parties.

After disposing of the childish twaddle in the *Matin* libel, Sir Rufus Isaacs turned to the American speculation. "Up to the time of the acceptance of the tender" in March he had never had any

dealings in any Marconi Company, though I would repeat that as the Attorney-General had never had any inkling of any negotiations between the Government, of which he is a member, and the Company, of which his brother is Managing Director, there would have been no impropriety, or indeed any objection, to his buying any number of Marconi shares *before* the acceptance of the tender. So far as he knew there was no contractual relationship in prospect between his Government and his brother's Company, though his counsel, it will be remembered, laid stress on the fact of the openness of these negotiations and imagined that the whole world took cognisance of the utterances of Mr. Godfrey Isaacs at a Company meeting. One of the many surprises in this affair is the insistence of clever men on false points.

It may be as well, as the case has been so overlaid with tedious details, to reproduce textually the short and simple if incomplete story as originally narrated by Sir Rufus Isaacs to Mr. Justice Darling.

Q. There is an American Company ? *A.* Yes.

Q. So far as you know, up till that date, March 7, was there any dealing or quotation in these shares ? *A.* Of the American Company ?

Q. Had you ever known of them ? *A.* I never heard of them till April.

Q. Is that that you never heard of the American Company at all until April ? *A.* Well, I am not quite sure whether it was a Company. I knew, of course, that there was some working of the Marconi system in America, whether it was under the English Company or a separate Company I did not know. I knew that Mr. Marconi and my brother went out there at some time in March. I knew after they had gone, but I never heard of the shares or the constitution of the Company in America until my brother returned, and he returned, I think, on April 8 or 9, 1912.

Q. Did you then learn that the American Company was issuing shares to raise new capital ? *A.* Yes. He told me of the various arrangements that had been made over there, and that it would be necessary to raise a capital, or had been necessary to issue shares to the amount of £1,400,000 to carry out some special arrangements that had been made for the purchase of the assets of another company, a competing company, the United Wireless Company, which had gone into liquidation in America, and also some important arrangements that had been made.

Q. Contracts ? *A.* Contracts with the Western Union Cable Company.

Q. We need not go into the details. *A.* No, he told me of that.

Q. At any rate, he told you of certain developments that had taken place in the American Company ? *A.* Yes.

Q. As regards the American Company, had they any interest in the profits of the Marconi Company. *A.* Oh no, they had nothing whatever to do with the Marconi Company in the sense of sharing the profits or having any interest in the profits of the

Marconi Company. They were a separate concern to work the invention of Marconi in the United States within the territorial limits of the United States.

Q. Then having heard of these shares in the month of April as you say, did you, to pass over some matters, eventually buy 10,000 of them? *A.* I did.

Q. Do you remember what date? *A.* April 17, just about six weeks after the announcement of the contract.

Q. Did you buy them at a premium? *A.* Yes.

Q. According to the market rate? *A.* At the market rate, and I may say that I satisfied myself before I did that, that they had no interest of any sort or kind with the British Government. I made quite clear about that.

Q. That follows from what you have said before? *A.* Yes.

Q. With reference to the shares of the Marconi Company at that date, you told us you had no interest in them? *A.* No.

Q. Had you looked at that date to see what price they had reached? *A.* Yes, I looked at it purposely. They had reached then 9¾, which is the highest price that they ever did touch. They had gone up from something like £4 10s. a share I think on March 7 or March 8, at which they were, and then for various reasons which I cannot of course go into, they had gone to the price of 9$\frac{11}{16}$ and 9¾, which was the highest price they had ever touched, and they had reached that by April 17.

Q. All that I want to show is that your purchase in the American Company had nothing to do with raising them up to that price. *A.* Oh no, nothing whatever.

Q. Now as regards the shares you bought, you sold some of them? *A.* Yes.

Q. Did you sell 1000 to Mr. Lloyd George? *A.* Yes.

Q. And 1000 to the Master of Elibank? *A.* Yes.

Q. Just tell us what happened? *A.* I was living on very intimate terms with them. We were great personal friends and are, and I told them what I had done. told them I knew about the American Company, and I told them of course that I should not have gone into it unless I was satisfied that it had nothing whatever to do with the Marconi Company, or with any contract which either had been made, or might be made, with the British Government; they were entirely independent. I told them that I thought it was a very good investment, and I told them exactly what I had done, the price that I had paid, and I told them that if they liked they could take from me 1000 shares each at the same price that I had paid for them.

Q. So far as you know, had either of them known anything of the American Company until then? *A.* I do not think so. I do not think they had ever heard of it. I am quite sure they never would have gone into it if it had not been for what I told them.

Q. Now you sold some of the other shares at a premium? *A.* Yes.

Q. As a result, you have at present about 6400 of your original purchase? *A.* Yes. I sold 3750. That sale averaged a profit—which eventually brings the whole transaction my having now 6430 left of the 10,000—the net result of the transaction is that at the present prices I have a loss of somewhere about £1100 or £1200, if I sold the shares at the present moment that would be the result. That, of course, applies to the whole 10,000.

Q. And that is the net result of the one deal? *A.* Yes, that is the net result of all the transactions that I have ever had either in Marconi, or in any other wireless enterprise.

Q. I do not know whether you know whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer or Lord Murray made a large emolument? A. They stand in about the same position, of course, that they have lost a few hundreds each.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: That is all I have to say.

That it was not thought good for the public to learn too much at once was manifest from the *lacunæ* in the narrative. There was no mention of the name of the vendor of these 10,000 American shares—who was momentarily assumed to be Mr. Godfrey Isaacs until later on Mr. Harry Isaacs appeared on the scene—or of the price paid for them beyond the statement that they were bought "at the market rate," a somewhat ambiguous phrase which promptly elicited the statement from the City that in the ordinary sense there was no "market rate" in American Marconi shares on April 17, as they were only "introduced" in London on April 19, two days after Sir Rufus Isaacs' "investment." There was much ingenious guess-work as to what the investor had paid in order to lose about £1200 on a transaction in which he clearly enjoyed considerable advantages over the general public in the shape of prior information. Still greater excitement was caused by the statement that Mr. Lloyd George, the arch-enemy of "unearned increment," had participated in this "flutter," together with the Chief Whip of the Party, and that they also had lost, although equally with their colleague they enjoyed the advantage of "ground floor" knowledge, even though they might not have purchased at "ground floor" prices; then the trio had evidently received valuable consideration from the Managing Director of *the* Marconi Company then negotiating with various Government Departments—including the Treasury—for the completion of the wireless telegraphy contract. Though "announced" on March 7, according to Sir Rufus Isaacs, on the Samuel theory it will be remembered there was no "contract" or even an "agreement" at that date, and no document could be laid before the House of Commons before July 19 because negotiations were still proceeding. If it was right and proper for the Attorney-General who, after all, had taken no part whatsoever at any stage of the negotiations for the contract, either before or after March, to buy Marconis in April, it must surely have been wrong and improper for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to participate, as his Department was concerned in discussions with the Company

until July, and, as parliamentary ratification was in any event required, Marconis were not precisely an ideal investment for a Chief Whip and Patronage Secretary. The triplet were admittedly as innocent in intention as unborn babes.

Supposing one were anxious, in the familiar phrase, to "nobble" a Government, by which we mean to cripple or weaken the independence of that Government, *vis-à-vis* oneself, how would one set to work and whom would one seek to influence? Surely the principal Law Officer of the Crown whose advice might be expected to be sought on questions of law, the Chancellor of the Exchequer the guardian of the public purse, and the Chief Whip and the Patronage Secretary with whom lies the management of the Party in Parliament; and if such transactions as these are to be whitewashed, there is scarcely any abuse or any form of corruption to which the door will not be opened when, in the inevitable deterioration of public life in this country under the operation of the Parliament Bill and the payment of members, less fastidious men than those now in power hold the reins of office, and the doctrine is openly proclaimed, as it is openly practised in more degenerate communities, that the first duty of a statesman is to feather his own nest. That is why, ever since circumstantial rumours first reached me, the Marconi Mystery appeared worth probing to the bottom. It is doubtful whether we are anywhere near the bottom yet. From every point of view the American speculation was a disastrous and discreditable episode to its participants, rendered doubly disastrous and doubly discreditable by the elaborate and disingenuous efforts of the Government to conceal the truth from the House of Commons and the country when the Debate of October 11 offered a golden opportunity of making a clean breast of it. The Master of Elibank possibly realised that under the circumstances the single service he could still render his Party was retirement, and as a consequence one of the most impregnable Radical strongholds, Midlothian, was transferred to the Opposition and the Master has become a wanderer on the face of the earth. Ministers must not be surprised if students of the Marconi Mystery hold the view that among the reasons for their lamentable silence when they should have spoken is that there may be something much worse behind, and although

the Coalition Press will take no hint from us, we would advise them, considering how they have already been "let down" by Mr. Asquith's colleagues over American Marconis, not to be too cock-sure that all Ministers and their immediate belongings have abstained from speculations in other Marconi Companies, including the British Marconi Company, which, in order to heighten the virtue of the American transaction, has been momentarily placed on the Index as an investment for Ministers by austere Radical journalists.

When at last the day of disclosures had dawned, one material fact was withheld from a public with a delicate digestion, if we read aright Sir Rufus Isaacs' evidence already quoted. To the enquiry as to whether he knew whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the Chief Whip "made a large emolument," the Attorney-General replied, "They stand in about the same position, of course, that they have lost a few hundreds each." This was interpreted—erroneously as it subsequently transpired—as signifying that there had only been one Ministerial deal in American Marconis by Mr. Lloyd George or the Master of Elibank, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer's further "flutter" only came out later and was another "nasty jar."

The German Press Bureau must have turned green with envy at the performance of the Coalition Press in connection with the *Matin* case. As a result of about thirty-six hours' reflection, these organs of light and leading, most of whom divide their time between blackguarding their opponents and proclaiming their own self-righteousness, were able to come out in chorus with almost identical praise of the implicated Ministers which unless one had the articles under one's eyes one could not have believed, would find an asylum in responsible and reputable newspapers jealous to preserve "the lofty traditions of our public life," in the cant of the day. They had, however, the merit of being vastly entertaining, and in this dull world it would not be fair to deny the reader the pleasure of perusing them. The *Westminster Gazette* must have had something in type to meet the occasion, as it came out with a characteristic "Note on the Case" on the day itself (March 19), from which we extract the following:

The account which Sir Rufus Isaacs gave, in tendering his evidence, of a certain

private investment which he—and at his suggestion, his friends, Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Murray—made in the American Marconi Company is, strictly speaking, irrelevant to this case, and cannot have been even the pretext for the allegations repeated by the *Matin*. Except that the American Marconi Company happens to share with the British the quite honourable name of Signor Marconi, the transaction would call for no comment on public grounds. Holders of shares in the American Company have no interest in the profits of the British Company, or in its dealings with the British Government; and the investment—the greater part of which the three gentlemen in question still hold—has led to a loss and not, as suggested, to a great fortune. Since the name, however, offers a possibility of misconception, Sir Rufus did wisely to be quite explicit on this subject; and, apart from the question of any relationship between the two Companies, the dates and circumstances which he set out in his evidence altogether preclude the idea that he was profiting by the boom or could have expected the slightest advantage from his official knowledge.

Feeling perhaps that the question had not been completely disposed of by this illuminating "Note," the *Westminster Gazette* published an equally characteristic leading article on the following day, March 20:

Sir Rufus Isaacs very properly took occasion yesterday to disclose one investment which he, and at his suggestion Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Murray, made in the American Marconi Company, a company which has no interest in the profits of the British Company or in its dealings with the British Government. Except that both companies share the quite honourable name of Signor Marconi, this transaction would have had no relevance to the charges which were before the Court yesterday; but, now that it is before us, there are certain kinds of comment which are quite legitimate, and, if they are made, the Ministers in question can take no offence. It may be said that they ought to have appreciated the misconceptions that might arise out of the common name of the two Companies. It may be said that they would have done wiser to disclose this incident sooner. All that is legitimate enough, though on the other hand there is much to be said for the view that the proper place for a disclosure of this kind was either before the House of Commons Committee or before a Court of Law, *where statements can be made on oath.** [My italics.] But there is one form of comment which, we submit, is not legitimate. That is, while accepting unreservedly the admission of the *Matin* that the charge of corruption is without foundation, and that the fact of the American investment offered not the slightest justification for it, to go on to say that this investment nevertheless offers a justification or excuse for the original authors of the libel.

The real state of the case is the exact contrary. The American investment offers not a plank, not even a tight-rope, for the retreat of those who have charged corruption; and we cannot imagine their appealing for indulgence on that ground. The Judge said rightly yesterday that the final exploration of this matter rests with the House of

* The artless suggestion that Ministers are only to be believed on oath is anything but flattering, but why has not the *Westminster Gazette* supported the demand of the *National Review* which urged that Ministers should go before the Committee months ago?

Commons Committee, and that Committee must pursue the matter with all rigour at the earliest moment. We want to know from these gentlemen whether they will do what the *Matin* innocently did for them—translate their insinuations into definite allegations. Or, failing that, whether they will tell us that they built their case on some knowledge or half-knowledge of the American investment. The Ministers whom they seemed to be aiming at *have been absolutely frank* [my italics]; it is now for their accusers to be equally frank. If, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Herbert Samuel, and Sir Rufus Isaacs are not the Ministers they are aiming at, they must tell us whom they are aiming at. To get absolutely to the bottom of these allegations and insinuations is the first task, and we are confident it will not be shirked.

Sanguine persons who expected something better from the *Manchester Guardian*—anticipations I never shared, because with the *Manchester Guardian* the end justifies the means, the end being, of course, the retention in office of a virtuous Coalition and the exclusion of the wicked Tories—suffered a bitter disappointment, as may be gathered from the following leader (March 20) which the great organ of progress in the North was not ashamed to publish:

Sir Rufus Isaacs, in his statement, also went far beyond what was necessary to refute the particular libel before the Court. He knew nothing of the negotiations between his brother and the Post Office until a few days before *the contract was signed* [my italics], was never consulted about it, and never had a conversation on the subject with Mr. Samuel or any other member or official of the Government. He had never had a share in the Marconi Company at any time. His only investment in the shares of any wireless telegraph company appears to have been made six weeks after the public announcement of the Post Office contract with the Marconi Company, when he bought 10,000 \$5 shares in an American Company called the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of America, which owns and works the Marconi patents in the United States but had no interest in the Imperial contract. Of these shares he sold 1000 to Mr. Lloyd George and 1000 to Lord Murray (then the Master of Elibank), thinking that he was doing them a service, but with rather unfortunate results for them, because the shares, which were bought at a considerable premium, are now quoted only at par, so that the investment shows a substantial loss for all of them.

We commend the frankness with which the Attorney-General has taken the public into his confidence with regard to *the only share transaction* [my italics] which might by ignorance or perversity be held to afford some warrant for the suggestion that he or either of the Ministers to whom he sold a part of his shares had sought a personal profit in connection with this much-debated Marconi contract. No doubt they wish now they had never heard of the American Marconi Company; no doubt if they had foreseen, when they were about to invest in its shares, the campaign of calumny that was so soon to be started by the Lawsons and the Maxses and their kind, they would have shunned anything with the name of Marconi on it. It is a hateful thing for a man of honour to have to explain that he is not a rogue. Even as things stand it will, we suppose, be possible for people without any sense of justice or common decency to say in private;

"Oh, yes; the contract was made with the British Company, and the shares were in the American Company, but these Marconi Companies are all mixed up with one another and they did buy Marconi shares after all." But honest people, and by that we mean people who honestly try to get at the truth of matters inviting their judgment, will ask themselves these questions: (1) Were the shares bought on the strength of early, inside knowledge that a contract was being negotiated? (2) Did the American Marconi Company and its shareholders stand to make any profit out of a Government contract with the British Company? (3) Did the Ministers who bought and sold these American shares make any attempt to conceal their names in the transactions in question? They will find that the date of the purchase, the constitution and limited sphere of operation of the American Company, and the fact *that the purchases* [my italics] and sales were made quite openly through the usual channels, remove the business far from any shadow of culpability. We may be disposed to regret that all the facts, constituting as they do a complete defence against any imputation of dishonour, were not made known during the House of Commons debate last October, but now that they are known *we can find nothing in them of which the most honourable man need be in the slightest degree ashamed* [my italics].

There are three questions in the foregoing article the answers to which are not precisely what the *Manchester Guardian* appears to imagine. (1) Ministerial speculators, at the time of their speculation, were in a position to know more about the Marconi contract than less favoured individuals, as they were members of a Government conducting the negotiations and moreover enjoyed the privilege of a special tip from the Managing Director of the British Marconi Company not shared by the outside public. (2) The American Marconi Company and its shareholders unquestionably derived immense advantage from the prestige due to the exceedingly favourable arrangement made by the British Company with the British Government, and the reader will see before he finishes this story that the American boom was largely built up on the British boom which, in its turn, rested largely on the agreement. (3) Ministers concealed the transaction until the twelfth hour. At the time that the *Manchester Guardian* asked these questions Mr. Lloyd George's further gamble in Americans remained undisclosed. Our premature contemporary went to the length of describing Sir Rufus Isaacs' *purchase* of 10,000 American Marconis as "made quite openly through the usual channels," which in its judgment "removed the business far from any shadow of culpability." Does the *Manchester Guardian* in the light of subsequent revelations maintain that Sir Rufus Isaacs' private purchase from his brother

was "made quite openly through the usual channels," thus removing "the business far from any shadow of culpability?" As Sir Rufus has himself admitted that he bought these share privately from his brother, that there was no contemporary documentary evidence of the transaction, and that among his objects was a saving of broker's commission, the *Manchester Guardian* should in honesty and candour admit that on its own canon the transaction is within the "shadow of culpability?" If so, why doesn't it say so? It not, what right has the *Manchester Guardian* to constitute itself the moral censor of the community when it misleads its readers on elementary matters of fact.

The case of the *Daily Chronicle* is equally piteous, because like its northern contemporary it had been misled by the manner in which the case had been presented before Mr. Justice Darling, though we do not suppose for a moment that the *Daily Chronicle's* attitude would be in the least degree modified by discovering that it had been once more imposed upon. After describing how "in his (*i.e.* Sir Rufus Isaacs) case also the whole bubble is completely pricked," the article continued (March 20):

He went on to add some interesting, though not strictly relevant, information which perhaps shows how such a bubble may be blown. Six weeks after the Government had accepted the Marconi contract and made the acceptance public, Sir Rufus bought 10,000 shares in the American Marconi Company. This company held no interest whatever in the English Company, and was formed for an entirely separate purpose, namely, to work the invention of Marconi within the territorial limits of the United States. Of these shares he sold 1000 to Lord Murray, then the Master of Elibank, and 1000 to Mr. Lloyd George, both of whom, as is well known, were his great personal friends and exceptionally intimate with him. The shares were bought at a premium, and all three statesmen eventually lost on them. We do not know how far any one will criticise this transaction, but it is worth observing that (1) they were bought not before, but six weeks after, the conclusion and publication of the Marconi contract, (2) though they were shares in "a" Marconi Company, it was an independent American enterprise with which the British Government contract had nothing to do, directly or indirectly, and upon whose fortunes the British Government could exercise no influence. *It is difficult to find any reason why the three statesmen should not have bought them* [my italics].

Our unfortunate contemporary fell into the same trap as the *Manchester Guardian* by imagining that disclosures were complete instead of being partial, though by the time it became necessary to confess that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been so

stimulated by the success of his joint gamble with Sir Rufus Isaacs as to embark on a separate venture with the Chief Whip of the Party, our contemporary's stomach was strong enough for anything, and doubtless if to-morrow it learnt that the entire Ministry were up to their neck in British Marconis we should be informed, to borrow and adapt its own language to the new disclosures, "it is difficult to find any reason why the *thirty* statesmen should not have bought them."

The *Daily News and Leader* endeavoured to put a brave face on the matter, cheerfully entitling its article "The End of a Slander." It might have appeared in either of the other papers quoted, and one cannot resist admiring the magnificent discipline of the Radical Press when Radical interests are at stake—so different from distracted and disunited Unionists. These quotations are intrinsically interesting because of their contrast with the attitude adopted at the time it was assumed by every Radical journal that Ministers were no more capable of gambling in Marconi shares than of committing bigamy or any other enormity, while they derive extrinsic interest from subsequent revelations extorted in cross-examination from Ministers by the Marconi Select Committee. The *Daily News and Leader* (March 20) thus sought to dismiss the matter:

> Sir Rufus volunteered the statement that, six weeks after the contract was announced and at the time when the Marconi shares were at their highest point he bought 10,000 hares in the American Company, 1000 of which he sold to Mr. Lloyd George. But the American Company had no interest in the English Company, could not enter into a contract with the British Government and could not profit by the contract or any contract which the English Company made. It was an ordinary transaction which had involved the purchasers in a loss.
>
> The probity of public servants is a matter of supreme national concern. We demand from them a standard of conduct that is above suspicion. We demand it because they are necessarily in the possession of our secrets and are the guardians of our interests. The Press has a duty to the public in this matter, but it is a duty which should be done not for malevolent or partisan purposes, but in order to keep the stream of our public life pure.

After this homily from the keeper of the Nonconformist conscience, one might have anticipated that the *Daily News* would at least have told the inculpated Ministers "Don't do it again." However, the Nonconformist conscience is peculiar and works in wondrous ways. Apparently the right way "to

keep the stream of our public life pure" is for Ministers to speculate in Marconi Companies and to devote their talents to concealing the fact from the public. On the other hand, when at last the gamblers are obliged to own up (I am quoting the conclusion of the incredible article in the *Daily News and Leader*), "the public have now some measure by which to estimate the venom and mendacity which has characterised one of the unpleasantest episodes in recent political journalism." It is a delightful code, though we cannot help suspecting that the authors of the article are conscious that they are making conspicuous jackasses of themselves.

I have not the *Star* of the moment, which presumably rose to the occasion, as it always does. With the Radical London Press in this frame of mind it was necessary for the *Dundee Advertiser* to do something sensational, so it calmly informed its readers (March 21) that "the Company (American) has no connection with the English Company of the same name"; which was followed by this suggestive statement which I have long been expecting but had not hitherto found in the organs of the metropolis, though doubtless it will reach them in time: "But if the purchase had been in the shares of the English Company itself the transaction on the date named would have been outwith [*sic;* ? outside] the scope of the charges made. By that time the announcement of the Agreement had been made and had had its effect, and a Ministerial purchaser would have been in precisely the same position as other men. But, as a fact, the shares bought were those of a Company which had no more connection with the Marconi Agreement than had the Baltimore Railway." So far the *Dundee Advertiser* bears the palm and is entitled to hearty congratulations.

May I suggest that should the editor of the *Dundee Advertiser* happen to know of any Ministers who bought British Marconis on the innocent date of April 17, which hardly seems credible, as they were then at the top of the boom, or say five weeks before, which, according to the *Dundee Advertiser* would bring the transaction within the period of innocence, as in its own words "the announcement of the agreement had been made and had had its effect," he will kindly notify me by postcard of the details of the deal. An intelligent Minister buying, say, 10,000 British

Marconis, as he might perfectly well have done on Dundee doctrines on, say, March 17, would a month later have pocketed £50,000 without running any risk whatsoever. Though if the Samuel view that there was no contract or agreement in March be correct, and we know in any case that there were prolonged negotiations between the Government and the Marconi Company for weeks and months afterwards, hypercritics might be disposed to contest the accepted creed of the "Metropolis of Marmalade," even should it spread under duress to Coalition circles in Manchester and London. It is perhaps chiefly interesting as showing the possible ramifications of the Marconi Mystery and the deterioration from former standards that such opinions should be seriously set forth by a great organ of progress in the far North. British Ministers in spite of limitations used to be thought above doing what the Radical mouthpiece of Mr. Churchill's constituency cordially approves.

VII. "MORAL TURPITUDE"

While Ministerialists of every degree in and out of office retired into corners to curse the trio of gamblers for the hideous mess they had got themselves into, and incidentally their Party, one single Radical journal, so far as we know, had the courage to say openly what Radicals were saying privately, namely the *Nation*, which, it will be remembered, had with the rest of the world interpreted the categorical Ministerial disclaimers of October 11 as covering all the "associated" companies of the Marconi group. Unlike its Coalition contemporaries, the *Nation* stood to its guns and refused to regard an "investment" in American Marconis as a virtue, while an investment in British Marconis remained *anathema maranatha*. In an article entitled "Ministers and Marconi Shares" (March 22), this organ of advanced Radicalism, which politically is at the antipodes to the *National Review*, being passionately Home Rule, anti-Imperialist, anti-French, anti-Russian, pro-German, little Navy, no Army, Woman Suffrage, &c. &c., candidly acknowledged that

> some statements were made by Sir Edward Carson in his speech for the plaintiffs in the action for libel brought against the journal *Le Matin*, by the Postmaster-General and the Attorney-General, which will greatly surprise the public. The specific statements of the *Matin* were withdrawn and apologised for. These were that Sir Rufus Isaacs and Mr. Samuel had bought shares in the Marconi Company at 50 francs and sold them at a profit, rising to 200 francs. Neither Minister had any dealings with *the* Marconi Company, and no Minister derived profit from dealings in any of the subsidiary companies. But it appears that on April 8th [*sic*] Sir Rufus Isaacs bought 10,000 shares in the American Marconi Company, when the Home Company had reached, or nearly reached, its top price, and the separate American Company was raising capital for a purely American enterprise. One thousand of these shares were sold to Mr. Lloyd George, and another thousand to the then Master of Elibank. The shares have since depreciated and such of them as are now held by these Ministers are held at a loss or a fall from the price which they commanded last spring.

Our contemporary, writing at that time, could not concive any more than other people that there was yet another American

speculation to be disclosed, and the *Nation* subsequently protested against "piecemeal" revelations, but even as it was, writing on March 22, some days before Sir Rufus Isaacs and Mr. Lloyd George appeared before the Marconi Committee with additional evidence, our contemporary observed: "In commenting on these disclosures, we feel bound to say that, in common with the rest of the public, we were under the impression that the charges or suggestions of Ministerial dealings in any shares associated with the various Marconi Companies had been disposed of by Sir Rufus Isaacs' statement in the House of Commons on October 11."

So would anybody else of an unsuspicious turn of mind who regards the present Government as exclusively composed of Bayards. The *Nation* added:

> It appears that we were wrong and Mr Maxse was right in concluding that the Attorney-General's denial had reference simply to dealings in the shares of the parent company (with which the Government's contract was made) under circumstances implying corruption. Such a charge would undoubtedly lie against a Minister who made use of his official knowledge of the pending contract in order to buy shares at a low price with a view of selling them at a high one as soon as the inevitable boom set in. This, of course, was the one charge or suggestion which involved moral turpitude or the betrayal of a public trust. Sir Rufus Isaacs confined himself to repelling this capital accusation. But we are bound to offer the comment that the public gave his denial a wider range, and understood it to falsify the mass of gossip which attributed *any* participation by *any* Ministers in *any* Marconi undertaking.

Our contemporary derived this small consolation, namely that "the purchase of shares in the American Company, having been made *a month after the signature of the contract* [*sic*; my italics], when the top price had been nearly realised and the 'boom' exhausted, was not a matter into which an element of corruption—*i.e.* of the improper use of information authoritatively and secretly acquired—could have entered. We cannot, therefore, understand why full disclosure was not made in October or at the moment when the cheeks of Rumour were first inflated with the tale of Ministerial purchases." The *Nation* deplored "a grievous error of judgment . . . committed when Sir Rufus Isaacs touched a share in a Marconi venture—in itself a useful and legitimate enterprise—and commended the transaction to his colleagues."

The article concluded as follows:

Corruption is hardly alleged in this matter; and we need not, therefore, discuss this gravest of all imputations on the conduct of a public man. But our political leaders have to consider not only what is right but what is in the highest sense expedient. They have to reckon with malice and uncharitableness, and that in itself should be a warning to choose their path with scrupulous care. But, above all, they have to bethink themselves that democracy is constantly on its trial, and that in its interests they are bound to show a special and rigorous delicacy in every transaction in which Government and private enterprise approach each other as buyer and seller.

The *National Review* has never pretended to be a pulpit or to lay down the moral law for all men, though it is obvious to everybody who cares for his country that if the "personal honour" and incorruptibility of our public men is unaffected by the transactions unfolded in the Law Courts and elsewhere, there can be no reasonable expectation of maintaining the standards which have been our greatest safeguards for the security of public life in the past. As regards "moral turpitude" and the "betrayal of a public trust" is it not morally indefensible, is it not the grossest abuse of a public trust, for Ministers to convey the exact opposite of the truth to the Commons, and through the Commons to the country, because they have not the courage to own up to a gross impropriety, but hope against hope that it may remain undetected? In view of recent events is there no "moral turpitude," is there no public treachery in the outrageous outburst with which Mr. Lloyd George tried to shut up Mr. Lansbury during the Debate of October 11, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer interjected:

The hon. member said something about the Government, and he has talked about "rumours." I want to know what these rumours are. If the hon. gentleman has any charge to make against the Government as a whole, or against individual members of it, I think it ought to be stated openly. The reason why the Government wanted a frank discussion before going to Committee was because we wanted to bring here these rumours, these sinister rumours, that have been passing from one foul lip to another behind the backs of the House.

I do not for a moment affect to understand either the parliamentary code or the standards of that "personal honour" of which we are hearing too much just now, but to the ordinary

man "moral turpitude" and "betrayal of a public trust" are far from being too strong expressions to apply to Mr. Lloyd George's conduct in thus wilfully suppressing the truth and suggesting the falsehood concerning his colleagues, himself, and Marconi speculations. At the very moment the lie was on his lips he might have had his Marconi shares in his pocket—had they not been under lock and key at his brokers. Other Ministers might have had other Marconi shares in their pockets. Provided they are not in the British Company the Coalition would have approved, while Dundee would have been delighted had they been British provided they were purchased after March 7. We are getting on.

VIII. A SOLID CABINET

In any other country the disclosures—fragmentary and partial as they were—in the *Matin* case would have been immediately followed by a reconstruction of the Government caused by the resignation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Attorney-General. In France their *démissions* would only have been a matter of moments. In Germany the Emperor would have manifested his pleasure without undue delay. In the United States public opinion would have overwhelmed any President who hesitated to take action, and there certainly would have been no hesitation on the part of President Roosevelt, President Taft, or President Wilson in insisting on the withdrawal of the culprits from the Cabinet. But in this unhappy land, under Asquith auspices, all impossibilities are possible and only those things don't happen which ought to. At no time does there appear to have been any question of Ministerial resignations. Whether Sir Rufus Isaacs or Mr. Lloyd George offered to relieve the Premier of their embarrassing presence is unknown, but had they done so it would merely have been a matter of form, for they well knew that Mr. Asquith was not in a position to bid them adieu, being hopelessly compromised by his own conduct.

The day after the *Matin* case Mr. Bonar Law, Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, gave the Prime Minister his opportunity (March 20) by asking the following question: "I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question of which I have given him private notice, namely, when he proposes to make a statement with reference to the evidence given in the action against *Le Matin*?" To this the Prime Minister replied with well-feigned surprise, the key to which was subsequently furnished: "I only received the right hon. gentleman's notice since I came into the House. It had not occurred to me it was my duty to make any statement in this matter. Of course,

I shall be very glad to answer any enquiries the right hon. gentleman or any of his friends may wish to put." To this Mr. Bonar Law replied: "I had hoped that the right hon. gentleman would have taken a different view, and that he will even now reconsider it; and in order to enable him to do so I shall put the question again later." Innocent outsiders naturally imagined that Mr. Asquith would have jumped at the chance so promptly provided by the Leader of the Opposition either to ask for an adjournment of the House in order that the position of Ministers might be considered, or what would have been still more welcome, that he would have been able to announce that Mr. Lloyd George and Sir Rufus Isaacs had decided to put themselves right with public opinion by tendering their resignations which had been accepted. But he had overpowering reasons for doing nothing of the kind. Had he suggested resignation to his speculative colleagues they might have retorted "resign yourself."

That the Government were all more or less in the same boat might have been inferred from the tone and temper of their organs. Nevertheless it was another tremendous shock to public opinion to learn a few days later (March 26) that the Prime Minister had known ever since last summer of the common venture of the Attorney-General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Marconi shares. Major Archer-Shee asked "whether he was informed by the Attorney-General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer that they had been dealing in the shares of the American Marconi Company before the Debate on the Marconi Agreement of the 11th October; if so, whether he informed any members of the Marconi Committee of this fact; and whether he can state if he has any information as to whether these or any other Ministers have been dealing in the shares of the Argentine, Canadian, Spanish, Russian, or French Wireless Companies associated with the British Marconi Company?" Even a case-hardened House of Commons was startled when Mr. Asquith replied: "I was informed by the Master of Elibank at the end of July or the beginning of August that he and the Attorney-General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had purchased shares in an American Marconi Company. At a later date in August the Attorney-General repeated the statement to

me, and I believe added that they had sold some of the shares, but retained the bulk of them. Both assured me that the purchase was made *after the publication of the contract* [my italics] between the Post Office and the English Marconi Company, and that the American Company had no interest direct or indirect in that contract. That was the whole extent of my information at the date of the Debate in October. The answer to the second and third parts of the question is in the negative."

In other words, Mr. Asquith acquiesced in the misleading, if not mendacious, speeches of his colleagues on October 11, knowing them to be what they were. His statement that the April gamble occurred "after the publication of the contract" which only occurred in July takes one's breath away. His assertion that he had informed no members of the Marconi Select Committee of the American gamble prompted Major Archer-Shee to put a supplementary question: "May I ask the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Asquith) . . . whether he has enquired whether the hon. member for Pontefract (Mr. Booth) and the hon. member for Forfarshire (Mr. Falconer) were in possession of the same information before they examined the editors?" The reader will appreciate the seriousness of this question, which meant were members who tried to bully journalists about rumours of speculations themselves aware at the time on the authority of Ministers that there had been actual speculations? When asked whether he had enquired this was the answer:

THE PRIME MINISTER: No, sir; certainly not.
MAJOR ARCHER-SHEE: Will he do so?
THE PRIME MINISTER: No, sir.

The reader will draw the only possible inference from these statements, which, as will be seen, was subsequently confirmed by the evidence of the Attorney-General.

Mr. Joynson Hicks enquired: "May I ask the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Asquith) whether he does not think it desirable that these facts (*i.e.* the American Marconi speculations) should have been communicated to the House in the Debate which took place at that time (October)?" To which the Prime Minister had the effrontery to reply: "No, sir. I confess they seemed to have *no relevance* [my italics] whatever to the scandalous charges which were then being circulated, and *I really attached*

no importance to them." [My italics.] The reader has only to turn back to the long quotation from the article in the October *National Review* on a previous page which specifically raised the question of the American gamble to estimate the plight of his Majesty's Ministers.

Although not strictly in order, it may be as well to finish off the parliamentary interrogatories before coming to Ministerial evidence with its further disclosures before the Select Committee. The Coalition now fairly seasoned against shock had nevertheless a somewhat "nasty jar" when, in reply to a question of Mr. Terrell, April 2, as to when the Prime Minister "first became aware that the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Lord Murray (the Master of Elibank) had purchased the additional 3000 shares in the American Marconi Company," Mr. Asquith replied: "At the end of December last year or the beginning of January the present year." Thereupon Mr. Terrell enquired whether Mr. Asquith had "any specific information to give to the House from any other member of the Government?" To which Mr. Asquith replied with his usual "No, sir, certainly not." Nothing daunted, Mr. Terrell pressed the Prime Minister as to whether, "In addition to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Attorney-General, he had knowledge of any other members of the Government being interested in or having had dealings in the shares of the American Marconi Company, or any of the other Marconi Companies." To this the Prime Minister replied, "No, sir." Mr. Terrell persisted: "After that reply, may I ask the right hon. gentleman whether his refusal to answer may be taken as an admission that possibly some other members of the Government had dealings in the shares?" Mr. Asquith only feebly repeated himself: "No, sir, it may not." We have travelled a long way from October 11, 1912, when Mr. Herbert Samuel, who was himself at the time aware that his colleagues were involved in the American Marconi Company, permitted himself with the sanction of the Prime Minister to inform the House of Commons, "Neither I myself nor any of my colleagues have at any time held one shilling's worth of shares in this Company, directly or indirectly, or have derived one penny profit from the fluctuations in their prices. It seems shameful that political feeling can carry so far that lying tongues can be found to

speak and ears found to listen to such wicked and utterly baseless slanders such as these." To-day the Prime Minister dare not even inform the House of Commons that Ministers have or have not had dealings in Marconi Companies.

As illustrating the *moral* and the morality of his Majesty's Ministers, we have the singularly mean treatment of an official in the Post Office, Mr. J. E. Taylor, a staff engineer, who perpetrated the enormity of buying thirty British Marconi shares on December 21, 1911, on which he made a few sovereigns when he sold them in March. At that time, although Mr. Herbert Samuel knew that his own colleagues had gambled heavily in American Marconis before the conclusion of the contract with the parent Company he had the hardihood to write this hypocritical letter on November 13, 1912, when his attention was called to Mr. Taylor's crime:

> The Postmaster-General has recently learnt, with grave displeasure, that Mr. J. E. Taylor (Staff Engineer) had engaged n transactions in the shares of the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company at the time that the Department was negotiating an important contract with that company. On December 15, 1911, Mr. Taylor was present for the first time at a meeting of the Committee which was advising in the negotiations, a meeting at which the subject of the contract was fully discussed. On December 21 he bought thirty £1 shares in the Marconi Company. On March 19, 1912, Mr. Taylor sold these shares, the price having meanwhile appreciated by about 50 per cent. The Postmaster-Genera cannot regard as satisfactory Mr. Taylor's explanation of these circumstances. Action such as his is wholly contrary to the traditions and practice of the Civil Service, and could not fail, if it became usual, profoundly to impair public confidence in its integrity. . . . The Postmaster-General directs that Mr. Taylor be reduced to the rank of Assistant-Superintending Engineer.

When Major Archer-Shee (March 25) asked whether in view of the admissions in the *Matin* libel action that Cabinet Ministers had speculated in the American Marconi Company, "and in view of the fact that the American Marconi Company was an associated company of the British Marconi Company and so described in their balance sheets, he will now reconsider the case of Mr. J. E. Taylor, Staff Engineer in the Post Office, who bought thirty £1 shares in the Marconi Company, and who was reduced to the rank of assistant-superintendent engineer on account of this action?" the Stiggins of the Post Office replied with all the unctuous rectitude at his command: "Mr. J. E. Taylor was one of the expert advisers of

my Department on the subject of wireless telegraphy. His official position brought him into touch with the negotiations that were proceeding between the Department and the British Marconi Company, and he bought an interest in the Company which was about to contract with the Government at a time prior to the public announcement of the acceptance of its tender." There was, as a matter of fact, no official announcement of the acceptance of the tender, the Postmaster-General keeping enquirers at bay for over four months. Stiggins continued: "The other purchases referred to in the question (*i.e.* the American speculations) were made in the shares of a Company which was neither itself contracting with the Government nor had any interest whatever in any contract with the Government, and they were made some time after the acceptance of the British Government's tender was *universally known*" [my italics]. This statement can only be described as a falsehood, because Mr. Samuel himself steadily refused to make it "universally known" and concealed the agreement from the House of Commons. From this we may measure the value of his assertion that "there is no similarity, therefore, in the circumstances, and no ground for the reconsideration which is suggested."

Putting the Attorney-General upon one side as having at no time taken any part in the negotiations with the Marconi Company, we are unable to see the unbridgeable gulf which separates the case of Mr. Lloyd George, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Taylor, except that one being a plutocrat "invested" on a large scale, while Mr. Taylor's "speculation" was of a microscopic character. Mr. Lloyd George's Department at the time of his investment (April) was concerned in the negotiations with the Marconi Company, as the contract was only completed and "announced" in July. Officially he was no outsider, as he knew a great deal more about the matter than other people, and he was in an exceptional position for forming an opinion as to whether the contract with the British Marconi Company would or would not benefit the American Marconi Company. Moreover, the "tip" on which Mr. Lloyd George operated originated with the Managing Director of the British Marconi Company (the reorganiser of the American Marconi Company) actually negotiating with the Government. Therefore,

except that one was a large transaction and the other a small one, there would appear to impartial onlookers to be a distinction without a difference between the case of Mr. Lloyd George and that of Mr. Taylor. But the Radical plutocracy are a law unto themselves and there is no redress for their victims. The Taylor case should prove a valuable object-lesson in bringing home to the people of this country the true character of the men by whom we are misgoverned.

Every day elicited some fresh fact emphasising the intimacy between the American Marconi Company and its British parent, which had been, to put it mildly, slurred over in the *Matin* case. Ordinary books of reference, such as *The Stock Exchange Year Book* (1913), revealed the suggestive fact that the Board of the "Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of America" included three members of the Board of the British Marconi Company, including Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director, and Commendatore G. Marconi, the Chairman of the British Marconi Company. The Postmaster-General found himself chivvied from pillar to post in parrying questions, and made pitiful efforts to maintain the theory upon which at the moment the "personal honour" of Ministers was alleged to depend. Having pledged himself as to the independence of the American and British Marconi Companies, on the strength of which he differentiated the big gamble of the Chancellor of the Exchequer from the little gamble of Mr. Taylor, he was ultimately reduced to saying: "I have no official information on these matters. The fullest information with respect to the purchases made by my right hon. friends is being given by them to the Select Committee of this House."

IX. BACK TO THE MARCONI COMMITTEE

As nothing more could be gleaned from the sulky and taciturn occupants of the Treasury Bench, and Mr. Bonar Law had wisely postponed taking action until Ministers had told their story upstairs, Committee Room No. 12 became once more the pivot of the plot. It is necessary to say a preliminary word about the Marconi Committee. It would be more agreeable to pay conventional compliments than to criticise its procedure if the facts permitted. It was appointed last October on the strength of a promise given by the Prime Minister on August 6 (*i.e.* before the summer adjournment) that the Marconi Agreement, which had already become a child of mystery, should not be hustled undiscussed through the House of Commons by the familiar Coalition machinery. The contract was rightly regarded with suspicion by private members of all parties, except the Nationalists, who have been as Marconi mad as the Postmaster-General himself—Dublin was always a conspicuous centre of the great South Sea bubble. Ministers were desperately anxious to get the Agreement through the House of Commons and would have done so had they dared. It has only lately transpired that Mr. Herbert Samuel made a determined unofficial effort to evade Mr. Asquith's pledge that the whole question should be investigated by a Select Committee. This curious episode was extracted from him in cross-examination by Lord Robert Cecil (April 2), who asked:

You continued to the very end anxious that this Agreement should be ratified before the adjournment?—To which the Postmaster-General replied: Very much so, simply because I wanted to get the stations. I think the public interest has suffered and is suffering very greatly at this moment by the delay.

Q. So I understand you to say. After you had heard of all these American transactions, that did not alter your view that it would be right to get the Agreement ratified? *A.* No, not at all. To this moment I do not see the smallest reason.

Q. Without an enquiry before a committee? *A.* Certainly. I do not see anything in any way dishonourable or corrupt in anything my colleagues have done, or the smallest

reason from anything they have done why this contract should not have been ratified straightway by the House of Commons *without any enquiry whatsoever* [my italics].

Q. That probably explains what I am about to put to you. On the 6th, I think it was, of August, the Prime Minister made a statement that the contract would not be ratified until after the adjournment. Do you remember that? *A.* Well, it could not be. It had not the sanction of the House of Commons.

Q. I know; but the Government would not attempt to obtain its ratification until after August 6? *A.* That is so, because by then, much to my regret, it had been pushed off and postponed so long that it was thought improper that a matter of this importance, in which so many members of the Opposition took an interest, should be decided in a debate on the last day, or even the last day but one, of the Session.

Q. Do you remember meeting Major Archer-Shee in the lobby late that night—about twelve o'clock; or perhaps I might say, do you remember sending for him some time in the afternoon, and asking him to withdraw his notice of opposition? *A.* Yes. I put it to him in this way. I told him what so far as I remember I do not think was known before, that the Committee of Imperial Defence and the Admiralty attached great importance to this being done soon—that is, the stations being erected soon—and I put it to him as a Member of Parliament whether, unless his opposition was a very strong one, he could see his way to allow the contract to be ratified in order that the Empire could get these wireless stations. I put it to him that the strategic importance of them was regarded by the Government as being very great, and I think I said to him—I am not quite sure—that if we were involved in war and had not got any long-range wireless stations at all, and if our cables were cut, it would be very greatly to the discredit of the Empire generally, and that the Government could not take that responsibility, or words to that effect. That was what was in my mind, and I thought it my duty to use my utmost efforts to get the contract through for that reason.

Q. Did he tell you that his objection was so great that he was afraid he could not? *A.* Certainly

Q. Did you meet him late that night and tell him, notwithstanding that, the Government proposed to try and obtain the ratification before the adjournment? *A.* What date was that?

Q. That was August 6? *A.* Well, I was very anxious to get it myself.

Q. It was after a statement by the Prime Minister? *A.* I held very strongly the view that we ought to have had a full day's debate before the adjournment, and the Master of Elibank indeed undertook that the matter should be discussed before the adjournment, and I quite understood from him that it would have been settled. I had raised the point on one or two occasions with my colleagues, immediately after the contract had been signed, and pressed again and again that there should be an opportunity for discussion. I rather wished not to have a Committee of Enquiry—not in the smallest degree because I thought there was anything to be concealed, but because *I thought these rumours about shares were utterly unfounded* [my italics], and that it was my business as Postmaster-General to get the stations as soon as I could, and I foresaw if there was a Committee it would probably take months before the matter could be settled, though I did not think it would be so many months as it has been.

Q. Then the answer really is that you did say to Major Archer-Shee that you did

propose to get the contract through? *A.* I do not remember the conversation, but I very likely had it, because I was very anxious, and in fact until the day before the adjournment I still had hopes of a full debate, and ultimately I said: "If I cannot have that full debate and a decision, at any rate I must insist on making a statement on the facts so far as I was concerned to remove some of the misapprehensions that were abroad," and, as the Opposition still objected to the matter being taken—the Chief Whip was in negotiation with the Opposition to see if we could not settle the matter then and there—it was ultimately decided on those lines, and an opportunity was given to me to make a statement on the contract generally, *the facts of which had never previously been laid fully before the House* * [my italics], and it was arranged that there should be no debate or division, and the matter held over until the autumn.

Q. The question that I am anxious to put to you is whether you met Major Archer-Shee and told him: "Notwithstanding all that the Prime Minister said this afternoon, I still hope or intend to get the contract ratified to-morrow?" *A.* I do not recollect the conversation, but certainly it was my hope up to the last moment that I should have got a debate, and, if necessary, a division on it.

It was known in parliamentary circles at the time that Ministers, particularly the Postmaster-General, were unusually anxious to secure the ratification of a contract about which they had been exceptionally secretive, the negotiation of which had been punctuated by an unprecedented gamble on Stock Exchanges at home and abroad, and though no one imagined for a moment that strategic or imperial considerations weighed in this instance with Ministers any more than in other instances, it was somewhat charitably supposed that their eagerness to burke inconvenient debate was merely due to their knowledge that they had made a perfectly preposterous arrangement with the Marconi Company which would not bear the light of day. Unfortunately something always turns up in the Marconi Mystery to make a bad action of the Government seem worse. We know now that at the time of this attempt to jockey Major Archer-Shee into withdrawing his opposition Mr. Asquith was aware of his colleagues' speculation in Marconi shares. Possibly he surmised that others had trodden the same slippery path. Sinister light is thrown upon Mr. Samuel's action by an answer to a question addressed him by Mr. Rawlinson, member

* Is not this contention destructive of the case made by Ministers and their supporters that they had no advantage over the general public as regards inside official knowledge when they bought 10,000 Marconi shares in April. Mr. Samuel emphasises the fact that so late as August there were facts never previously laid fully before the House.

for Cambridge University, in the House of Commons on March 26. Mr. Rawlinson naturally wanted to know whether the Postmaster-General at the time he made his speech in the House of Commons on October 11 "was aware that his colleagues, the Attorney-General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had held shares in the American Marconi Company." Mr. Samuel returned the following written answer: "The answer is in the affirmative. I first knew of the matter at the end of July or beginning of August 1912." Therefore when he appealed to Major Archer-Shee (on August 6) on high patriotic grounds to abandon his opposition to the Marconi contract so that it might obtain parliamentary ratification without the enquiry previously promised by the Premier, Mr. Samuel was not merely seeking to save his own skin, because enquiry must inevitably expose his ineptitude. He may have been animated by the yet stronger motive of finally closing the door on the gigantic skeleton in the Government cupboard which might destroy them should it ever be discovered. Ratification without enquiry would have combined the salvation of the Post Office with the escape of Ministers. There have indeed been narrow shaves throughout the Marconi Mystery, and the fury of the Jewish jackals of the Coalition with Major Archer-Shee gives us the measure of the service he rendered in resisting the pressure put upon him last August.

The August plot failed, and the Recess brought a respite during which public opinion was successfully aroused by a succession of articles from Mr. Lawson's pen in the *Outlook* to which special attention was drawn in the September *National Review*, to which Major Archer Shee contributed a short and pointed article dwelling on the objections to the Agreement with the Marconi Company from the practical point of view. This was followed by leading articles in the *Morning Post* and the *Spectator*. Both these influential organs have been unwaveringly on the side of clean government, though if I remember aright, the *Morning Post* at no time associated itself with the rumours concerning Ministerial speculations, while the *Spectator* confined itself to calling attention to those rumours as requiring an answer. Otherwise this intensely interesting question continued to receive the go-by—so far as I know—apart from the vehement articles in our lively contemporary, the *New Witness*, to which it is

difficult to refer because they are *sub judice* owing to a criminal libel action by Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, to which it was understood on no less an authority than Mr. Muir, the Treasury Counsel, who is appearing for the prosecution, that Mr. Herbert Samuel was likewise a party. But the latter has quite recently disclaimed any connection with the case. One can hardly be guilty of contempt of court in looking forward to this action, even if it be not permissible to comment on any surrounding circumstances.

The general boycott of the Marconi question was only broken down last October, when Mr. Lawson recapitulated the substance of his *Outlook* articles in the *National Review* of that month, which, as was pointed out on a previous page, appeared a few days before the Debate. That this arraignment was present to the minds of Ministers is self-evident from their speeches. Mr. Lawson's article concluded by calling particular attention, as the reader is aware, to the shameless gamble in American Marconi shares, using stronger language about that particular episode than about any other aspect of the Mystery. Ministers nevertheless made the speeches already quoted, in every case indignantly, and in the case of Mr. Lloyd George furiously, resenting the infamous suggestion that they were capable of anything so gross as speculating in Marconi shares. The House of Commons and the public interpreted these sweeping declarations as meaning *any* Marconi shares when they spoke of "this Company," because the various companies were so intimately connected and had been collectively discussed in the article which aroused the celestial ire of his Majesty's Government.

There was moreover an additional reason for assuming that Sir Rufus Isaacs' denial included the American Company. The Attorney-General had been so incautious as to send a telegram to the *New York Times* to be read out at the "surprise" banquet given in honour of Mr. Marconi by that enterprising organ in New York, whither Mr. Marconi, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Solicitor of the Company, the chief Marconi Jobber, and probably others had hastened directly the British Marconi Company had vanquished the British Post Office on March 7, when its "formal tender" was accepted on the Samuel theory, and the "contract

got" on the Isaacs theory. The main object of the American pilgrimage was to sue a water-logged American United Wireless Company for infringing Marconi patents, though the presence of the financial element in the pilgrimage suggests that other objects than litigation were in view. In any case the telegram sent by Sir Rufus Isaacs at a time when the British Marconi Company was still negotiating with the British Government, although the contract had been "got," was a blazing indiscretion rendered more blazing from its unfortunate terms. This is the form in which it appeared in the *New York Times* of March 17, 1912:

London, Sunday, March 17th.

Please congratulate Marconi and my brother (Godfrey Isaacs, General Manager of the Marconi Company) on the successful development of a marvellous enterprise. I wish them all success in New York and hope that by the time they come back the coal strike will be finished.

Sgd. RUFUS ISAACS
(Attorney-General of Great Britain).

One phrase in this telegram might be interpreted by unsophisticated persons, who in all cases outnumber sophisticated persons, as celebrating the Company's capture of the British Post Office. [This agreement was subsequently described by the organ of the Marconi Company—for it has a special organ from which many interesting items may be gleaned about the Marconi standpoint (the "Marconigraph")—as nothing less than a "partnership" with the British Government.] There was another equally unlucky phrase in Sir Rufus Isaacs' telegram as it turned out, for in wishing the Chairman and the Manager "all success in New York" he might have been interpreted as meaning "all success" in the important business on hand. The Attorney-General had no such thoughts in his mind, but human beings, especially American human beings—who attach enormous importance to great names and official connections—being what they are this message undoubtedly promoted Marconi interests across the Atlantic. It was followed by a great boom in British Marconi shares largely due to American purchases, so it is not insane to regard it as an element in helping to drive up British Marconis £1 within a week of March 17 and £5 within a month. Again this public backing by the British Attorney-General may conceivably have contributed to the collapse of

the United Wireless Company, judgment being given by consent on March 25. One must be careful not to exaggerate these things, but it is idle to pooh-pooh them. The Company acquired tremendous prestige by nobbling the British Government, which was increased by the folly of that Government in allowing a one-sided account of the Agreement to appear. The thoughtless telegram of the British Attorney-General coming on top of this lent itself to exploitation by boomsters. Why not admit the blunder and have done with it?

Sir Rufus Isaacs airily dismissed his New York message as "a very trumpery affair" during the Debate of October 11, and this statement alone, apart from more solemn and positive asseverations, helped to convince Members of Parliament that emphatic Ministerial repudiation of rumours covered other Marconi Companies, especially the American Company, as well as the prolific parent. Looking back it is well-nigh incredible that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Attorney-General, the Postmaster-General, with the approval of the Prime Minister, should have deemed themselves acting straightforwardly by their colleagues in Parliament in allowing it to go forth that no Minister had ever held any interest in "this Company" when, as a matter of fact, three Ministers had held American Marconi shares worth £40,000 on April 19—Heaven alone knows what other Ministers may have had or hold to-day in other Marconi Companies—and that at the time of the Debate 6400 shares of the 10,000 purchased were still in Ministerial hands. There was likewise the further independent joint venture of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the late Chief Whip of the Party which involved the carrying over of shares at brokers' rather than at bankers' rates. The Prime Minister only heard of this transaction later.

We are now told that for reasons which no one pretends to understand Ministers could not mention their American "investment" in the House of Commons because it would have been irrelevant to that particular Debate—would the Speaker have ruled it out of order?—though they ultimately dragged it in by the heels in the *Matin* case, where it was ten times more irrelevant. Ministers were under an obligation to deal frankly with the House of Commons, but they were under no such obligation to the *Matin*, which put in no defence of its impos-

sible libel and was clearly not entitled to have this extraneous matter thrust upon it. The *Matin* case remains an unsolved mystery.

The Postmaster-General followed up his omnibus disclaimer on behalf of himself and the entire Cabinet by declaring that "*This Committee* (i.e. *the Marconi Select Committee*) *which will be appointed will enquire into every aspect of this question, and members of the Government will be most ready to appear before it. Every member of the House may have full confidence that while every part of this transaction will come under the searchlight of examination, it will be shown that there is no uncleanliness in any quarter.*" This scarcely pointed to an early disclosure of Marconi speculations. We are now told that Ministers were literally panting for the appointment of this Select Committee, as they were burning to announce their American investments—however innocent and irrelevant—which cruel circumstances had prevented them from confiding to the House of Commons. There was an unusual interval between the Debate and the Committee's appointment owing, it was said, to the necessity of excluding independent Radicals like Sir George Croydon-Marks and Sir Henry Norman, who really knew something about the question, but who had committed the unpardonable crime in a Radical Member of Parliament of criticising Government policy. Between them they annihilated the Marconi Agreement during the Debate in the House of Commons and later on they repeated the performance in their evidence before the Marconi Committee, which was thus constituted at the end of October:

MINISTERIALISTS.

Sir Albert Spicer, Bart., M.P. (chairman)	Sir Herbert Roberts
Mr. J. Falconer, M.P.	Mr. A. Gordon Harvey, M.P.
Mr. F. Handel Booth, M.P.	Mr. William Redmond, M.P.
The Hon. Neil Primrose, M.P.	Mr. J. Mooney, M.P.

Mr. James Parker, M.P.

UNIONISTS.*

Mr. George Faber, M.P.	Mr. H. Terrell, K.C., M.P.
Lord Robert Cecil, K.C., M.P.	Mr. L. S. Amery, M.P.
Mr. Donald Macmaster, K.C., M.P.	Mr. Harold Smith, M.P.*

* The following changes have been made in the original personnel of the Committee Mr. J. G. Butcher has replaced Mr. Terrell, and Sir Frederick Banbury occupies the place of Mr. Harold Smith, while in the Ministerial camp Mr. Gordon Harvey has retired in favour of Sir W. Essex. Mr. Primrose has since retired and Mr. Harvey has returned.

As the reader will see by a simple sum in arithmetic, the Coalition commanded a majority of nine to six, which lends special significance to the frequent announcements that such and such a decision has been arrived at "by a majority." An ignoramus, like myself for instance, might infer that such a body in which the supporters and admirers of the Government ruled the roost would at once have gratified the yearning of Ministers to appear at the earliest possible moment and make those disclosures which a punctilious dread of wasting Parliamentary time had restrained them from making in the House—disclosures which caused such havoc five months later. The amiable Chairman, Sir Albert Spicer, who has at all times shown himself to be solicitous concerning the "personal honour" of our public men, was verbally informed at the outset of the enquiry by the Attorney-General, that he, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Postmaster-General desired above all things to testify, though he does not seem to have been told why. On one occasion Sir Rufus Isaacs went so far as to sit down and write a letter to the Chairman asking to be called, but the judgment which has shown itself so singularly at fault throughout this affair prevented him from sending it. The Postmaster-General, even better informed as to the Attorney-General's correspondence, declares that the latter contemplated writing several letters—none of which, however, reached their destination, for just as Ministers had been petrified at the prospect of squandering parliamentary time, so they were equally hyper-sensitive of interfering with the procedure of a Select Committee. Of Mr. Lloyd George's epistolary efforts in this direction we hear less, though like Sir Rufus he regarded it as a cruel wrong not to be heard. An official who once served under Mr. George cynically observed: "The worst of my chief is that he can neither read nor write." So we must not expect too much. Nor is there any evidence that the Master of Elibank cabled from Putumayo or Popocatapetl, or wherever else he may be making a study in oils—or even sent a wireless message through the Marconi Company which at a pinch can communicate in ten minutes between London and New York—that the single object of his existence was to appear in Committee Room No. 12 to give his views on American Marconis either as a gamble or as an investment.

The public, not that it counts for much nowadays, undoubtedly expected that at the earliest available moment the Cæsar's Wives, of whom the Cabinet was believed to be exclusively composed, would insist on disposing of malignant rumours and in crushing their foul-mouthed traducers. Unluckily no written evidence has yet been produced—though of constructive writing there is testimony—of any Ministerial desire whatsoever to appear before the Marconi Committee in defence of their "personal honour." It is true that so long ago as January 13 the Postmaster-General hastened upstairs in order to try and prevent the Select Committee from appointing another Committee of independent experts to report as to the best wireless system—in which he happily failed, and it is one of the few happy things about the Marconi Committee. The mere existence of this expert Committee abundantly justifies the opponents of the Agreement in preventing its ratification without further consideration. Instead of opposing this sensible suggestion of the Select Committee Mr. Herbert Samuel would have been better employed, when at last he got an audience, in mentioning the American deal, which those involved were panting downstairs to disclose upstairs.

Indeed in the peculiar position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Sir Rufus Isaacs and the Postmaster-General, as sponsor for the Government, one cannot help feeling that however sacrosanct a Select Committee may be Ministers would have been fully justified, after verbally intimating their desire to the Chairman to be heard, and perhaps remonstrating with him if the Committee declined to accede to their request—in writing the following joint letter :

11 Downing Street,
November 10th, 1912 (*circa*)

DEAR SIR ALBERT SPICER,

Although we are of course fully aware that Select Committees determine their own procedure, and that the Marconi Committee is master in its own house, we would beg you to ask your colleagues to spare an hour, or perhaps a day, in the course of any one of your three sittings next week in order that we may make a communication which brooks no further delay. There was no time during the brief Debate on Friday October 11th to state all the facts concerning the numerous Marconi Companies, and it did not seem relevant to any of us to refer to any but the British Marconi Company, to which accordingly we confined our speeches and our disclaimers, but now that a Select Committee is sitting to investigate every ramification of this affair we are all anxious at the earliest possible moment, so that

there may be no room for any misunderstanding, to make it known that two of us, namely the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Attorney-General, bought ten thousand shares (of which a thousand were taken by the late Chief Whip) in the American Marconi Company last April. There was likewise a minor transaction later on, in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Chief Whip were concerned, in the same Company. We have lost on these transactions though we did not invest in order to lose, but that is neither here nor there.

With so many gross and malignant rumours flying about we desire that the whole truth should be known and authorise you to read this letter to the full Committee. To all of us, though for different reasons, the matter is important, and we ask the Committee to allow us to appear as suggested. Should they for any reason which to us would be unintelligible decline to grant this request we should feel bound, in our own interests, as well as in justice to our colleagues in the Cabinet, including the Prime Minister, who occupies a somewhat false position at present, to publish this letter. We regard our personal honour as demanding a full and prompt disclosure, and we cannot consent to waive our judgment on such a matter, anxious as we are to avoid disturbing the procedure of the Committee over which you so ably preside.

We beg to remain,

Yours sincerely,

DAVID LLOYD GEORGE.
RUFUS ISAACS.
HERBERT SAMUEL.

No one will be found to suggest that such a reasonable request from such a quarter would have failed in its object, and none will contest that the lack of determination on the part of Ministers to get before the Committee at the beginning of the proceedings, in fulfilment of the implied pledge of Mr. Samuel, proved to be a tragic blunder.

X. A MYSTERY WITHIN A MYSTERY

There is, however, an alternative theory already hinted at. Beyond a perfunctory suggestion to the Chairman, Ministers took no practical steps to gratify an ambition which was at once a plain duty. The Post Office, which has obviously and invidiously briefed certain members of the Marconi Committee, appears to have inspired, if it did not control, the proceedings, though the Committee once broke loose as has been noted. Months were wasted with official evidence which chiefly served to exhibit the mingled arrogance and ineptitude of the Post Office. Meanwhile Ministers were chafing under the delay in their appearance on infinitely more important matters. The Marconi Agreement was worth destroying, but the reputation of our public men is worth preserving. What did it all mean? Then we had a prolonged cross-examination, or rather badgering, of Mr. Lawson by carefully coached counsel for the Post Office, evidently enjoying the confidence of Ministers, which had been withheld from the Chairman. Mr. Falconer wasted several days on meticulous matters remote from the case. He was lauded in the Coalition Press as another Sir Charles Russell, and "the Man from Forfar" became the hero of the *Daily News and Leader*.

Where does Mr. Falconer stand to-day? The new Sir Charles Russell has become singularly silent. It is observable that he studiously followed the lead of Ministers during the catastrophic Debate of October 11 by ignoring Mr. Lawson's trenchant attack on the American Marconi boom with which the names of Ministers were specifically associated. Why did Mr. Falconer leave the American Marconi business severely alone? It might, of course, have been an oversight. On the other hand he might have been "tipped the wink" from official quarters. On this there is serious evidence, and if the House of Commons cares about its own reputation, or the reputation of its Select Committees,

the matter can hardly remain where it stands at present. It places the Government in a more odious light than before, which is saying a good deal.

To bring out the point it is necessary to anticipate. In cross-examining Sir Rufus Isaacs (March 27) upon his speech in the House of Commons, Mr. Macmaster said: "I want to put to you that some people might think . . . that while you were making a full disclosure of your relationship to the shares, you should also have made a statement with regard to these American shares, but you do not agree?" To this the Attorney-General replied: "I agree, if you mean when I come before the Committee; I quite agree. As I have told you, a number of persons knew all about it."

Q. With regard to coming before the Committee, had you in mind at that time that this was a circumstance which should be explained to the Committee? *A.* What I had in mind was that I should come before the Committee, and go from the beginning right up to the end, with the story exactly as I have done.

Q. As you have done here? *A.* Yes.

Q. Did you really have in your mind at the time you made that statement to the House that when the Committee was appointed you would come before it, and that you would make the statement before the Committee that you have made here now? *A.* Yes; I had a statement in my mind that everything I knew in connection with the Marconi Company, either before or after the period covered by the charges, would be stated before the Committee from first to last.

Q. Did you go to the Chairman of the Committee after the appointment of the Committee and tell him you had an important communication to make to the Committee, and ask for urgency to hear it? *A.* I do not look upon it as an important communication.

Q. You do not? *A.* I never have.

Q. Did you mention to any member of the Committee, before you came here as a witness, your relationship to these American shares? *A.* *Certainly* [my italics].

The reader will appreciate the point of these questions and answers. No communication concerning the American investment had been made to the Chairman of the Committee or to the Committee at large, but it had been mentioned to some members of the Committee. The word "certainly" is conclusive on this point. Then, when the cat was partially out of the bag, Mr. Falconer intervened with a ponderous premeditated impromptu objecting to such questions as improper, all the more as the subject had been raised in the House as to whether the Prime Minister had communicated with him and Mr. Booth

on this very question of Ministerial speculations in American Marconi shares. He appeared appalled at the abyss yawning before the Coalition should there be a disclosure of the communications that had passed between the Government or members of the Government and members of the Committee—presumably privileged members as they did not go through the Chairman and were certainly not communicated to the Committee at large. Such communications may have been designed to deflect the course of the enquiry while giving those "in the know" as great an advantage over the rest of their colleagues as, say, insiders had over outsiders in speculating in Marconi Companies. The conduct of Committee men who tried to browbeat journalists about rumours of Ministerial speculations while the cross-examiners were themselves aware of actual Ministerial speculations because they had received the information from Ministers themselves, need not be stigmatised here—it speaks for itself.

Happily Mr. Falconer's interjection was, as observed, too late. He might have been a Minister. The Chairman was appealed to, but he did not apprehend the drift of the objection. "I want to know exactly what I have to rule on."

MR. FALCONER: I understood Mr. Macmaster's question was as to whether Sir Rufus had had any communication with any member of the Committee—with the Chairman or any other member of the Committee—upon the subject.

LORD ROBERT CECIL: Let us know what Mr. Macmaster did ask.

MR. MACMASTER: What I intended to ask the witness, and what I think I did ask him, is whether he made a communication to the Chairman of this Committee, or to any member of the Committee, of the fact that he had purchased and sold these shares in the American Company.

MR. HAROLD SMITH: And I think Sir Rufus answered the question.

MR. FALCONER: I do not know whether he did or did not, but I was raising the general question because it had been raised by these questions outside. Mr. Macmaster has asked me what my objection is, and I state it formally in a sentence.

MR. MACMASTER: *The witness has answered the question* [my italics].

MR. FALCONER: Whether he has or not, I object to the line of examination, on the ground that it is not desirable that we should have evidence of what may or may not have passed between members of the Committee and those whom they may have seen.

LORD ROBERT CECIL: There is a distinction which evidently must be taken. It may be desirable to ask a witness whether he has made a communication to the Chairman. We are agreed as to that.

MR. FALCONER: I did not raise any question as to that.

This last remark of Mr. Falconer clearly exonerates the Chairman and accords with the evidence of Sir Rufus Isaacs, who does not pretend to have made any communication to the Chairman, but it confirms the suspicion concerning communications made in the interests of politics by the Government, or members of the Government, to selected members of the Committee so as to enable them to keep the enquiry off ground dangerous to Ministers, and very probably to postpone the appearance of Ministers in the hope that something might turn up, as for instance the breakdown of the journalists which would enable "a majority" of the Committee to say there was no case for them to answer and therefore no need for Ministers to come. Possibly the pæans of triumph of the Coalition Press were already in type in anticipation of such an apotheosis. Sir Rufus Isaacs evidently wished to answer this question and have the matter cleared up. No imputation therefore lies upon him in this respect. Mr. Falconer was terrified of Mr. Macmaster's very proper question which, in justice to the Attorney-General, should have been allowed.

The Chairman finally ruled that the propriety of Mr. Macmaster's question must be discussed in private, but happily it had already been answered. Sir Rufus Isaacs had "certainly" informed members of the Committee of his American speculation. Who were the privileged members and what other communications were made to them on behalf of the Government. Mr. Falconer's alarm was eloquent in view of his position as leading counsel for the Post Office. The decision of the Committee was announced the next day, when Mr. Macmaster informed the Attorney-General: "I have to ask you a question which was postponed yesterday in order that the Committee might have time to consider whether it should be asked or answered. I am going to read it, but I wish to tell you in advance that you are not to answer it. There has been a ruling *by a majority* [my italics] of the Committee that you are not to answer the question. The question is: Did you make any communication to any member or members of this Committee of the fact that you had purchased shares in the American Marconi Company, and, if so, when did you make that communication, or communications, and to whom?" To this Sir Rufus Isaacs replied: "I understand I am not allowed

to answer it." Upon which the Chairman said: "In disallowing the question I am requested by the Committee to say that we do so because *the majority* [my italics] of the Committee have decided that it is a breach of the understanding come to at the commencement of the sittings of the Committee that it was not only the right but the duty of any member of the Committee to receive any communication which any person might wish to make to him."

This decision provoked Mr. Harold Smith (one of the minority of the Marconi Committee) to write an illuminating letter to the Chairman, Sir Albert Spicer, which throws a valuable sidelight on its proceedings. The writer asked to be relieved of his membership of the Select Committee on the following grounds:

> Two members (Mr. Falconer and Mr. Handel Booth) have been publicly charged * with having received and withheld from the Committee most vital information, which, had it been communicated to their colleagues, must have very much shortened and, I submit, have materially altered our proceedings. These two members have not denied this charge, and one of them has publicly objected to a question which was put to a witness with the object of testing its accuracy. This objection was upheld by a majority of the Committee, which is thereby precluded from obtaining information to which, in my judgment, it is entitled. I desire for the present to refrain from all comment. I can only draw my own conclusion, with the result that I regret that I cannot see my way to further attend the meetings of the Committee.

Equally illuminating was the verbose homily which Mr. Smith's spirited action provoked from Mr. Falconer, who referred to the agreement of members of the Committee at the beginning of the enquiry that "it might be the duty of members of the Committee to receive any communication which might be made to them by any one which might assist them in ascertaining the truth with regard to matters referred to the Committee. There, therefore, can be no suggestion of any impropriety on that ground." Mr. Falconer added that Mr. Smith's letter contained a suggestion that information obtained by himself or other members of the Committee had been withheld from the Committee generally, "the implication being that it was the duty of any member of the Committee, who heard anything bearing upon its proceedings which was important, to convey it to the Committee. According to my view any attempt on the part of any member of

* By the *Daily Express*, which dealt with this episode with that gratifying vigour which is conspicuous by its absence from many "Unionist" organs so-called.

the Committee to put before the Committee facts of that nature would have been entirely irregular, in the first place, *because the original statements were not made on oath; and in the second place the member of the Committee would be making statements upon matters as to which he himself had no knowledge* [my italics], and on every rule which guides courts of law or committees in attempting to ascertain truth, that course seems to me to be open to the gravest objection." This is colossal. Should Sir Rufus Isaacs tell Mr. Falconer that he had speculated in American Marconi shares, which we take to be the net result of Sir Rufus Isaacs' answer to Mr. Macmaster's question and Mr. Falconer's objection to that question, Mr. Falconer had no reason to believe Sir Rufus Isaacs because the Attorney-General was not then speaking on oath, therefore he was precluded from communicating this information to the Chairman and the Committee generally. While they were engaged in probing rumours of Ministerial speculations and bullying journalists for referring to matters of common knowledge, Mr. Falconer and his friend, Mr. Handel Booth, *ex hypothesi* had learnt from the lips of Ministers themselves that such rumours were at any rate founded to the extent that three Ministers had held 13,000 shares in one of the Marconi Companies. The parliamentary code of "personal honour" is naturally beyond our ken. Will the House of Commons uphold the doctrine of the new Sir Charles Russell? One can guess what the old Sir Charles Russell would have thought of it. It is worthy of Colney Hatch. Mr. Handel Booth hastened "to identify myself with the statement made by Mr. Falconer."

XI. MINISTERS AT LAST

After the *Matin* case the Marconi Select Committee decided to interrupt the journalistic evidence on Rumour in order to hear Ministers on Speculation. To simpletons who derive their daily information from the Radical Press this must have appeared an unwarrantable decision. The journalists had been smashed to smithereens, and one of them had been "reported" to the House of Commons. Meanwhile Ministers had been completely vindicated by their glorious triumph in the *Matin* case, from which they had emerged more pure than the driven snow. It was, of course, true that they had had "a flutter" in American Marconis, but this was regarded as an investment such as Dr. Clifford might have made without detriment to his reputation. Moreover, as showing their extreme punctiliousness in keeping their public duty and their private interests apart the Triplets had actually lost money. Nothing would tempt them to make a farthing out of Marconis, so they had deliberately gone in with their eyes wide open with the object of losing as much as they could afford. Consequently their conduct commended itself to every intelligent purist. Alternatively, had they made money, it would merely have proved their good faith as members of a Government in making a wireless telegraphy contract with the Marconi Company that they should be willing to invest their hard-earned savings in one of its offshoots, and, so to speak, back their opinion. Happy the country with such far-seeing practical Ministers. What could the Marconi Committee have to ask them? Why not continue crucifying the real villains of the piece—the journalists—who had made imputations upon our Bayards. It was most bewildering, nevertheless the faithful trio appeared at last in Committee Room No. 12.

The Attorney-General led the way on March 25, and just as judges usually make a mess of their wills through knowing too much law, Sir Rufus Isaacs was anything but an impressive

witness, presumably through excessive knowledge of cross-examination. His evidence in chief contained some statements already familiar to the reader, though he broke new ground in amplifying his previous account of the American speculation. It should be said that he was placed at a distinct disadvantage by the refusal of the Coalition majority of the Committee to allow him to say what communications he had made and at what dates to any members of the Committee concerning his Marconi speculations. On the other hand he was allowed to indulge in irrelevant declamation, loudly applauded by a claque at the back of the room. When Mr. Douglas Hogg asked leave to cross-examine Sir Rufus Isaacs and other Ministers on behalf of the *Outlook*, the *National Review*, and Mr. Lawson —who had been so disgracefully blackguarded by the blackguards of the Radical Press—the request was refused by the usual "majority."

The Attorney-General narrated that on the return of his brother, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, from New York, whither he and Mr. Marconi had gone on business, and as the witness subsequently learnt with reference to the litigation pending with the United Wireless Company of America for infringing Marconi patents—the date of March 25 having been fixed for the trial—the three brothers Isaacs, Mr. Harry Isaacs (who now makes his first bow to the public), Sir Rufus Isaacs, and Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, lunched together on April 9, 1912, at the latter's suggestion. The Managing Director of the Marconi Company then explained what had happened in America, informing his brothers that "he had made himself responsible for and absolutely undertaken to take a very large number of shares himself in the American Marconi Company in circumstances which he detailed to me, and what he wanted to know was whether my brother Harry and myself would take any shares in this company." Sir Rufus asked several questions as "the matter was quite strange to me at that moment. I asked him first of all whether the American Company had anything whatever to do with the English Company. He told me substantially in these words that the English Company was a shareholder, and a large shareholder, in the American Company, but the American Company had nothing whatever to do with the English

Company, was not interested in its profits, was not in any way concerned with the undertakings of the English Company, but its operations were limited to the territory of the United States, and that it was confined to that." Sir Rufus Isaacs likewise enquired whether the American Marconi Company "had any interest at all in the contract which had been announced on March 7—and he explained to me that it had absolutely none; it did not make one halfpenny difference to the American Company whether this contract which had been accepted on March 7 was accepted or not—it had absolutely nothing to do with it."

He recommended it as "a very good investment," the main reason being "that they had bought the assets of the United Wireless Company, which had been the chief competing company in America with the American Marconi Company," thus securing "a number of stations and assets which were of use to the American Marconi Company; that the American Marconi Company had bought the assets of this company, which was in liquidation, which he thought was a very good thing because they had got a number of stations which they would be able to use with certain alterations." This complicated statement was intended to mean, and on careful analysis will be found to mean, that the English Marconi Company captured the United Wireless Company and the American Marconi Company bought these valuable assets from the English Marconi Company, the transaction being a most profitable one for the latter. At this same lunch Mr. Godfrey Isaacs told the Attorney-General that probably the most important thing was "that for the first time they had got a working arrangement between a Cable Company and a Wireless Company—that is to say, they had entered into an agreement with the Western Union Cable Company, which I understand is the most powerful Cable Company in the United States, having some 25,000 stations." Under this agreement "they had got trade preferential terms with them for anything that had to pass over the land lines of the Western Union, and that the Western Union was to have boxes outside all its stations for Marconigrams as well as for cablegrams; and generally that the agreement that had been made was a most excellent one." In order to carry it out the American Marconi Company would have to increase its capital by $7,000,000 or

£1,400,000, making the share capital of the American Marconi Company $10,000,000 or £2,000,000.

The problem was how to raise this new £1,400,000, for the American Directors were in a difficulty owing to their shares being considerably under par, "and they felt a doubt—more than a doubt perhaps—whether they could, in spite of the new arrangement that had been made, successfully issue this capital." The reader should follow the transaction with scrupulous care bearing in mind that Sir Rufus Isaacs, though giving the substance of what he had heard on this fateful April 9, was now better acquainted with the details through subsequent information. "Then there was a considerable discussion about it (*i.e.* in America during his brother's visit) and it eventually resulted in the Directors of the American Company agreeing to issue the capital if the Marconi Company—that is the English Company—would undertake to guarantee the subscription." It is already becoming plain to the reader that the suggestion of partisan newspapers that there was no connection between the American and British Marconi Companies is, to put it mildly, a deviation from accuracy. Ultimately "it was agreed that the Marconi Company—that is the English Company—would guarantee the subscription of the issue of this £1,400,000 or $7,000,000 fresh capital, that arrangement having only been arrived at after Mr. Marconi and Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director, had discussed it, and after Mr. Godfrey Isaacs had undertaken that he could find subscribers for £500,000, that is $2,500,000." Thereupon the arrangement was entered into between the two Marconi Companies, and in the words of Sir Rufus Isaacs "so that what it really meant was that the £1,400,000 or $7,000,000 new capital would be issued by the American Company, the English Marconi Company guaranteeing its successful issue, and the Managing Director, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, having told Mr. Marconi and agreed with him that he would make himself personally responsible for placing 500,000 of those shares, which I understand he did."

The Board of the American Company, besides five or six American Directors, contained three Directors representing the English Marconi Company, "because until the new issue of shares the English Company was a big shareholder in the American

Company and they had a right to three Directors, and those three Directors acted as representing the interests of the English Company in the American Company." There can be no indiscretion in interpolating what has already been mentioned, that among these three English Directors were no less persons than Mr. Marconi, the Chairman of the English Company, and Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, its Managing Director. I am anxious to spare the reader as much finance as possible lest more important aspects of the matter should become overlaid with confusing details, but it is necessary to point out on Sir Rufus Isaacs' authority that prior to the increase of the capital of the American Marconi Company, the English Marconi Company held 35,000 shares ($25) in that undertaking, or £175,000, *i.e.* $875,000 out of $1,600,000 issued, "which would give them (*i.e.* the British Company) the controlling interest because they would have more than half the votes." The Attorney-General naturally asked his brother, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, "how he had the right to offer the shares to my brother (Mr. Harry) and me, and he explained to me that he was personally responsible for them. At that time (April 9) the greater portion, I am not sure of the exact figures, but something like 350,000 or 400,000 had been placed by him immediately at par." The new shares in the reorganised American Marconi Company would be $5 shares (£1) which was the denomination into which the $25 shares in the old company had been converted, and each $5 share would have its right to a new share, owing to the laws of New Jersey where the company was incorporated giving shareholders a preferential right on the issue of new shares.

In that way, as you will observe, the English Marconi Company had a preferential right to a very large number of the new shares to be issued by the American Company. That was the position. In respect of those my brother still remained responsible for a large number—I am not sure of the exact figure, but at any rate somewhere about 100,000, or it might be a little more. Then the matter was discussed between us, and I asked him whether there was any idea of what the value of the shares would be, and he told me at the time—I do not know that they were exactly dealt in, I do not think they were—that about 25s. or it might be 30s., might be the price of the shares.

Mr. Godfrey Isaacs considered "that they would be thought well of and would certainly go to a premium. All this was discussed between us at lunch (*i.e.* on April 9, 1912). The result of it was that I made up my mind not to have anything to do with

it—I did not take any of the shares, and I left. I left him with my brother Harry still discussing, and there the matter ended."

I have never been, at least I was not then, very definitely clear, but I had two things in my mind. I thought that £1,400,000 was a very large issue of capital, and the other thing was that I did not want to have any dealings with the English Company—that was the position. I did not really want to have any dealings at all with that company or with my brother Godfrey. I saw no objection to it. There was no legal objection of any sort or kind; I am not using the word in any technical sense. I saw no objection to it of any sort or description. Still, I had never had anything to do with him in connection with this matter, and on the whole I thought it was better that I should not, and I did not.

However little one might agree with the witness's inability to see "any sort or description" of objection to the proposed transaction, every one would heartily applaud his decision to refuse his brother's offer, as every one must equally regret subsequent developments. The other brothers evidently regretted that Sir Rufus should remain out of such a good thing, and some days later Mr. Harry saw him "and he then told me that these shares were certainly, he thought, going to rise, that they were thought very well of in America, that they were an excellent investment according to the view of those who ought to know over there, that he much regretted that I had not gone in for them; and eventually after some discussion with him he told me that the price then was 2 to 2 1-16th, something just round about 2 . . . and eventually I bought from him then (*i.e.* on April 17) 10,000 shares at 2."

At the date when he bought these shares "there never had been, so far as I know, the faintest suggestion of any sort or kind against the Marconi Company or against those who were working the Marconi Company. What I mean by that is that in April 1912 the contract had been accepted; and so far as I knew, and I think so far as the public knew, there was no question then of any difficulty being raised about this Marconi contract. That did not arise until, I think, sometime in July of 1912 when the Postmaster-General laid the contract on the table of the House and there was a motion to ratify it, and then a number of motions came on the paper which showed that there was undoubtedly a strong feeling." As the reader is only too well aware, one of the main counts in the indictment against the Government is that for weeks and months after the acceptance of the tender in March

the Postmaster-General bluntly refused information to the House of Commons, and to assume, as Sir Rufus Isaacs and his friends insist on doing, that the publication of a circular to their shareholders by the Marconi Company was a publication to the world is to trifle with a very serious question. The reader will find in the Appendix *inter alia* the successive questions addressed to the Postmaster-General from March onwards in the House of Commons by members of all parties, together with his replies, and in the face of these answers and the resolute refusal of official information how could an agitation arise against a contract of which the contents were practically unknown to the general public, apart from those who study financial intelligence and who might with diligence have discovered extracts from the Marconi Company's circular (which will also be found in the Appendix), which does not tally in important particulars with the final contract, thereby proving that the negotiations between the various Government Departments and the Company between March and July were not mere matters of form as we are now for the first time asked to believe. It was only when the contract was published in July that opposition could arise.

In this Review the folly of the Postmaster-General, who is an arrogant Jack-in-office, has always been insisted on, and every single syllable of Sir Rufus Isaacs' evidence serves to confirm it. Among other lessons now being learnt by British Mandarins is the fatuity of trying to bottle what Parliament and the public are entitled to know. After all we tax-payers pay these people princely salaries to do our business as we wish to have it done, and not as they think it ought to be done, and if they have come to hopeless grief they have no one to thank but themselves. It makes their position even more despicable that they should try and throw the blame of their own ineptitude and improprieties on to others who have told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Sir Rufus Isaacs as a member of the Government is perfectly entitled to state that in April 1912 he had no shadow of a doubt as to the ratification of the agreement of March 7, "I heard then that the tender had been accepted, and that there had been a good deal of enquiry into it and I thought that that ended it. That was the position in April." Yes, it

may have been the position of the Attorney-General, who had nothing to do with the negotiations and was never consulted about them, but it was not the position of the Postmaster-General who was acting for the Government in this matter and who was engaged with several other Departments in completing the contract, nor could it be the position of the public, who were perversely kept in the dark.

The Attorney-General explained that the shares he bought on April 17 from Mr. Harry Isaacs at £2 might have been bought by him from Mr. Godfrey Isaacs on April 9 at 1 1-16th, as there had been a large rise in the interval owing to American demands. Possibly misled by the wild statements of the Coalition Press printed on a previous page as to the openness of this fraternal transaction the Chairman, Sir Albert Spicer, asked, "And you bought them just in the ordinary way through your brokers and you have their sale notes?" To which Sir Rufus Isaacs replied, "No, I did not buy them through a broker, I bought them from my brother there and then on April 17, not through a broker. The transaction was entirely between us. . . ."

Q. I think the question of the broker was mentioned last week? *A.* You are quite right, but that is in regard to what follows. I never said that I had bought them through a broker, because if I were dealing with my brother there would be no reason why I should pay a broker's commission.

The editor of the *Manchester Guardian* should note this. Sir Albert Spicer persisted:

Q. But brokers had been mentioned? *A.* Brokers were undoubtedly employed, but later. If I may proceed in order of date, which probably is the most convenient or the Committee, when I had done this transaction I saw Mr. Lloyd George and the Master of Elibank. I do not think I should be right in saying that I had never mentioned American shares to them before. I probably had told them something about the conversation that I had had with my brother earlier, not as a matter of business but in discussing what happened. But there was no transaction or discussion between them and me until this date (April 17) when I had done the transaction. It is suggested that I was buying them because I thought they were a good investment, or a good transaction. Certainly, I have not said a word to the contrary. If I had not thought they were a good transaction I should not have purchased them. I cannot say that I bought them with the idea that they would result in a loss. I never made that suggestion. Having agreed then to purchase these 10,000 shares I told both Mr. Lloyd George and the Master of Elibank, with whom I was living on the closest terms of personal intimacy, what I had done.

The Ministerial Press it will be seen is more Ministerial than

Ministers. Sir Rufus Isaacs rates the public nothing like as low as some newspapers, and repudiates the absurd suggestion that he bought 10,000 American Marconi shares in order to lose money. He told Mr. Lloyd George and the Master of Elibank what he had been told, namely, "that these shares would undoubtedly rise in value. I told them what my own idea was with regard to it. I said that if they went up at all considerably I should sell part of my shares so as to reduce the price which I had paid, that I intended to hold, at any rate, half, and probably more, as a definite investment whatever the rise was that took place." His colleagues asked "when the money would be required. I told them also I thought very well of it, and that if they liked they could have a thousand each of the shares which I had bought, of course at the same price. I knew what was their financial position approximately, and I said to them as regards the money, because both of them said, 'What about paying for them?' they need not bother about that." The shares were not actually in existence at the moment and some time must necessarily elapse and at any rate "I told them they need not bother about it, as I would always give them plenty of notice before I required the money. The only thing that was said was that at any rate they, of course, would be ready to pay for them whenever the moment arose. That was the 17th (April). On the 18th, the next day, the shares rose considerably, to about 2⅜ or 2¾ in America, and I think there were dealings on April 17—in London—informal dealings, if I may so describe them—that is to say, there was not a regular market on the Stock Exchange, but there were dealings between members of the Stock Exchange."

The "market price in London" was as high as £3 on April 18, on which day the American Marconi Company authorised the issue of the new capital at a general meeting, before which authorisation "certainly there could be no official or formal dealings on the Stock Exchange." Sir Rufus Isaacs made a point of the fact that among the questions he had put to his brother Godfrey on April 9 was:

whether the public would get all the same information which was being given to me—that is, the substance of it—as to the arrangements which had been made in America and which would make these shares valuable, and he told me they certainly would.

that they were going to issue a circular, and they did issue a circular on the morning of the 19th which stated the substance of what I have told you; that is, the arrangements which had been made, particularly with the Western Union Cable Company, which was the important one. So that the public knew exactly as much as I knew. I think I should add that there would be, I think, this difference, that naturally I would pay much more attention to statements made by my brother in a matter of this kind than possibly the public.

"That is the only advantage I had in the matter." But surely there was this other advantage, namely, that Sir Rufus Isaacs bought his shares on April 17 on knowledge supplied by his brother on April 9, which was only given to the public on April 19. To the layman unversed in finance this would appear to be at least as material an advantage as the attention one brother would pay to another brother. Intelligent anticipation of events before they occur can hardly be more valuable in the Press than it is on the Stock Exchange. Sir Rufus Isaacs insisted that the Agreement between the Marconi Company and the British Government "never entered into the discussion at all, it never was used in America; it had no relation to the American Company, and did not assist the American Company in the slightest degree." But as we get on it will surely be found that the American Company was the creation of the British Company, whose prestige in America was enormously increased by its success with the British Post Office in March, which we may be sure was exploited for all it was worth, and perhaps a good deal more across the Atlantic. However, Sir Rufus Isaacs emphasised the impossibility of the American Marconi Company deriving any advantage, directly or indirectly, from the great coup, as I should call it, of the British Marconi Company in pocketing our helpless Post Office. Continuing his story, he explained that on April 19, when the American Company's circular was published describing the advantageous arrangements made and the issue of new capital, the shares were dealt with on the London Stock Exchange at a price varying from £3 to £4 during the day.* Then for the first time Sir Rufus Isaacs consulted his broker, telling him that he had bought shares "of my brother Harry, and he knew the nature of my interest and of my purchase." Being a sensible man—and the same observation applies more to the stockbrokers than to the Statesmen who have appeared in this case—

He (the broker) was very anxious that I should sell, and advised me very strongly to sell, and said that he thought the market was very much too high, that there had been a great rush to buy shares both from America and here, and he thought the price could not stand. I told him that he could sell for me 5000. I had at the time discussed with my brother Harry, and had arranged with him, that whatever I sold or whatever he sold should be dealt with together; that is to say, I did not want to take an advantage over him in the price that I might obtain or he over me in the price that he might obtain—whatever it was the proportion of sales was to be the same, and at an average price. I gave this order (*i.e.* for the sale of 5000 American Marconis) naturally in my own name to my brokers, who were my ordinary brokers, who have dealt for me for a long time.

Sir Rufus then telephoned to inform his brother Mr. Harry of what he had done, and the answer came, "You might sell another 2000, 3000, or 4000 more." On this Sir Rufus sold 2000 more, "and that was the sum total of the transactions." In other words, he sold 7000 shares on the opening day in London, of which various proportions belonged to his brother, and it was understood at the time to Mr. Lloyd George and the Master of Elibank, though as the evidence developed the transaction became somewhat confusing. Sir Rufus Isaacs dwelt on the fact that "all those transactions were done in my name: the contract notes were rendered to me in my name, the accounts rendered to me in my name, and, of course, it was all entered to me in my name in the ordinary way, as had been done in the case of other Stock Exchange transactions for years with the same broker. The instructions were given on the telephone by persons in my employ. I do not think I did any telephoning myself, except once in connection with it. Then when that had been done I sent the contracts to my brother because he had, of course, to deliver the shares." In fact it was almost as public as the announcement of the Agreement on March 7, and one wonders what such enterprising journals as the *Daily Mail* were doing in not ascertaining at the time and informing an ignorant public that the Attorney-General was greatly interested in American Marconis. Can he be sure that his transactions were not used for the purpose of booming the shares by persons known on the Stock Exchange as "bulls"? With all this correspondence and telephoning through third parties a considerable number of people would be "in the know," and speculators could hardly fail to be impressed by the fact that a man of the astuteness

and financial experience of the Attorney-General was a large investor in the latest issue of Marconi shares. The American shares are endorsed in blank and passed from hand to hand, "just as negotiable securities would."

June 20 was the selected day for the "special settlement," and in due course Sir Rufus Isaacs wrote to his brokers informing them that the requisite shares

would be delivered on my account through my brother Harry, and that they would take the shares from him and pay him—not actually him but his bank. No doubt you know that a bank usually holds the shares, and his bank handed over the shares as against payment. I wrote the letter of authority authorising him to do it, and he wrote to me saying he had written a letter authorising them to complete the transaction in this way; and it was completed in that way. The net result—putting the shares he had sold with the shares I had sold—was that my proportion of sales was 3570 shares, averaging £3 6s. 6d. per share. That is the sole extent of my interest. . . . That leaves me with 6430 shares, and applying the profit . . . made on the 3570 shares sold and [in ?] reducing the price paid for the 6430, the result is that the 6430 stand me at a cost of £1 5s. 3d. per share. That is the balance of the whole transaction. Now if you take the price as £1 . . . that would give roughly a loss of 5s. a share and on the 6430 shares it would be £1607 10s. Of that sum Mr. Lloyd George and the Master of Elibank owe me one-tenth each; that is to say, they are interested with me. So that in order to get at the result of my own transaction you would have to take from the figure which I gave you £320, which would leave me a loss of about £1300. That is the net result of the whole transaction. That is the beginning and the end, so far as I am concerned, of all the transactions that I have had, and that completed the whole business.

The statements of so skilled an expert as Sir Rufus Isaacs are somewhat difficult to follow, and though this may have been the end of all the transactions so far as he was concerned, it must be remembered that he had to pay a substantial cheque to his brother Harry, from whom he had bought 10,000 shares for approximately £20,000, that debt was only discharged, as subsequently transpired, so late as January 6 of this year. One finds oneself at every turn entitled to affix the word "mystery" to this amazing affair.

Coming to the burning subject of rumours, Sir Rufus Isaacs informed the Committee that he had first heard of them some time in July, though he did not know whether it was before or after an article in the *Outlook*. In explaining his unhappy speech in the Debate of October 11 the Attorney-General declared that on returning after the Recess, "I had become aware, of course, through the articles which were being written, of a very serious

character—to put it as plainly as I can in very clear terms—circulating a series of foul lies about myself, about Mr. Herbert Samuel, and also to some extent but I think less perhaps with reference to Mr. Lloyd George, lies which so far as I was concerned, or either of them was concerned, we were quite unable to find any foundation for, quite unable to trace the source of, and quite unable to understand—as I am to this day—how they were started."

When he got to the House of Commons his single desire was to make a statement dealing with the suggestion that had been made. The Prime Minister had already announced his willingness to appoint a Committee if it was desired. When they came back in October it was definitely determined by the Government in consequence of these rumours that a Select Committee was the only possible and proper course, "in order to make enquiry into all these facts and to prove that these statements were utterly untrue." Sir Rufus Isaacs was doubtful whether he should speak or not, though he was anxious to do so, as it was the first opportunity that he had had of making a statement. "But I was not quite sure whether the opportunity would be given me, as we were moving then for a Committee and it was quite clear the Committee would be appointed." During the course of the Debate various references and insinuations were made, so he got up and formulated in clear and specific terms "what were the charges or insinuations or suggestions which were made either against me or against other Ministers." To the charges thus formulated by the Attorney-General the Attorney-General made a complete answer. After having disposed of the suggestion that he had exercised his influence to obtain this contract for the Company of which his brother was Managing Director and had helped it in its negotiations with the British Government, "the next charge which I dealt with was, I thought, the gravest charge, which was that I had used the information which I had obtained as a member of the Government in these negotiations in order to buy at a low price shares in the company which was in negotiation with the Government, and to sell them at a high price when the news of the acceptance of the tender was published."

It would be interesting to know where that charge was

formulated, but Sir Rufus Isaacs must have found it somewhere as he spent a large part of the eleven hours in Committee Room No. 12 in repeating it in one form or another, always harping on the events of March, whereas April was an equally important date, because in April the boom in various Marconi companies was at its height. "That was the suggestion. I have no doubt the Committee have had the articles before them; and may I point out this, which I do desire to draw specific attention to, that that was the beginning and end of the suggestion that was made." A defective memory played the witness false, as it was certainly not the beginning or the end of the case presented in the October number of the *National Review*, which called public attention to the mad American gamble as the reader will see if he turns back to pp. 447, 448, 449. Sir Rufus Isaacs continued: "I agree it was a very grave one (the charge as formulated by himself), but that was the charge from beginning to end—that between the time, whenever it was, when the negotiations started and the acceptance of this tender on March 7 I had been using my information to buy shares in the Marconi Company, which were stated to have been at 12s., 14s., or 15s. at that time, and to have sold them when they rose either to £7, £8, or £9, or whatever it was. That, of course, was a very foul charge." Now, though I do not think that Ministers while in office should indulge in Stock Exchange speculations, even in the case of such a stable and steadfast concern as the American Marconi Company, there would have been nothing "foul" in the conduct of Sir Rufus Isaacs in speculating even in British Marconi shares, because as he has told the world over and over again he was totally unaware of any negotiations between that Company and the Government. No one, however, until he stated the fact, which has never been challenged since, could have guessed that the principal Law Officer of the Crown would have been a complete stranger to a contract involving intricate and disputable points of law.

Sir Rufus Isaacs having made a hideous blunder has never attempted to understand the position of critics of the Government, particularly the Postmaster-General, for allowing a huge Stock Exchange gamble to go on under his very nose in the shares of a company engaged in confidential negotia-

tions with the British Government, which were not finished either in March or in April, but three months later, public suspicions being stimulated by the inexplicable refusal of the Postmaster-General to take the House of Commons into his confidence concerning an arrangement which, according to Sir Rufus Isaacs, was practically finished in March. There is something in the psychology of very clever men which makes it peculiarly difficult for them to appreciate a perfectly simple point. However, to return to the Attorney-General's own view of the matter: "Whatever it might be in law (*i.e.* the charge as formulated by himself)—and that of course we need not discuss—it was the kind of charge which made any man who was guilty of it quite impossible in public life; and I need scarcely say that my great desire has been, and my desire is now, and it is for that I still ask the assistance of the Committee to trace these rumours, to ascertain who it is who is responsible for setting afloat these sinister stories, these insinuations and suggestions." It has apparently never occurred to Sir Rufus Isaacs that among those who were most interested in associating powerful members of the Government with Marconi speculations were "bulls"—including members of the National Liberal Club—interested in booming the shares, though for some mysterious reason it has suited some persons to represent these rumours as what is called a "bear" attack on the Marconi Company.

After a brief reference to his message to the Marconi Banquet in New York and to a minor point "which has been dropped" since his speech:

What I was anxious to do (in the House) was to give the lie to these insinuations and suggestions of this grave character which were being made—not made in the House, nobody made them in the House, but they were made outside the House. I stated that of course I was aware of them and would meet them. At that time the Committee was going to be appointed, and in the ordinary course we should come before it. It was stated then, I think, particularly by Lord Robert Cecil, who used these words, I remember: "Of course Ministers will submit to examination and cross-examination," to which we assented; and it already had been stated by us, and particularly by Mr. Herbert Samuel, that we were anxious to come forward and give our evidence before the Committee as soon as the Committee desired it. As soon as the Committee was appointed, and as soon as I knew who the Chairman was—that is to say, as soon as I knew you were the Chairman, Sir—I went to you and I stated to you that I was ready to come at any moment when the Committee was ready to take my evidence. All I asked was that I might have some twenty-four hours' notice in order that I might arrange my public duties.

That was at the very beginning and "from that time I have been waiting until the Committee thought right to summon me." Sir Rufus Isaacs had frequently considered whether he should not ask the Committee to hear him sooner,

because I smarted very much under the suggestions which still went about, and I was anxious to get before the Committee and submit myself for examination and cross-examination. But I took the view—whether rightly or wrongly it is not for me to judge—that I had no right as a Minister to claim any preferential position, and it was for the Committee to determine its own procedure, and to say when it desired the evidence and to follow out its own course, and it seemed to me that it might almost savour of presumption if I had asked the Committee to take my evidence, or any Minister's evidence, out of the ordinary turn in which the Committee desired it. For that reason, although I did once write a letter, on consideration I did not send it.

Every one will agree in regretting this false modesty on the part of the Attorney-General, the Chancellor of the Exchequer and any other Ministers who may have speculated in any Marconi shares. Sir Rufus was next asked by the Chairman whether when making his October speech the thought had not occurred to him that he might get rid of some of these rumours "if you mentioned your investment in the American Marconis, because both being Marconis you could easily understand one might get confused with the other?" To this he replied, "It did not occur to me, and it does not occur to me now. I am obliged to you for putting the question. I find it very difficult, and always have found it very difficult, to understand how any person who had information —I will assume he had information, I do not know whether he had or not, but there were books and entries in books with my name and contract notes and accounts—could with that information before him write the lies which were built up apparently upon such foundation. That is what I want to know, and what I am entitled to know." No one will quarrel with the witness for attacking his critics, but as no cross-examination by counsel was allowed his question can best be answered by another question. "What are the particular 'lies' of which he complains, and what defence can he set up for a denial which one of the most ardent members of his own party, Mr. Massingham, describes as having been generally interpreted as covering all Marconi speculations."

The Chairman added, "But you felt that your investment in the American Marconis did not form a proper topic for remark

in your speech," to which the same answer was given, "Not in the speech. Certainly I thought it proper for me to state it before the Committee." It is probably because one is a layman and not a lawyer that one is totally unable to understand why a statement regarded as absolutely irrelevant in the House of Commons during a Debate of which one primary object was to clear away suspicions, should be regarded as peculiarly relevant to a Committee which *inter alia* was to investigate those suspicions though it postponed that investigation for reasons not yet apparent.

However, Sir Rufus Isaacs is entitled to state his case in his own way. "What I felt in regard to the speech was that I wanted to deal with the specific charges. I confined my speech entirely, I think you will find by reference to it, to dealing with the four specific charges which were made, which I formulated. I did not want in any way to confuse any questions which were being raised on other matters with these charges." Had he been told in October that it would be six months before he would be called by the Committee he would have regarded the statement as ridiculous. "But at the time that this took place (*i.e.* the Debate), and when it was so definitely stated that we were going to be examined and cross-examined, and when so much importance was attached, and quite naturally, and if I may say so rightly, to the rumours that were afloat about Ministers, I certainly thought that it would be a very short time before we should be examined.". Sir Rufus Isaacs closed his evidence in chief with this statement worthy of the reader's attention in view of the extracts from the *National Review* already referred to on page 447.

May I add, and it is very important, that at that time no one had ever suggested that any transaction in any other Marconi Company, either Spanish, Canadian or American, would in any way savour of corruption or be improper, or was in any way the subject-matter of criticism of Ministers. That did not occur. The whole of the suggestion from beginning to end was limited, and I have refreshed my recollection with regard to it, and no doubt it is within the recollection of you, Sir, and the members of the Committee—to speculation before the acceptance of the tender of the 7th March was announced in the public press on the 8th March. That was the statement to which I directed myself, and which I wanted to contradict. That, I think, from beginning to end is all that I have had to do with the matter.

XII. CROSS-EXAMINING A CROSS-EXAMINER

The cross-examination of Sir Rufus Isaacs was opened by Mr. Faber and interrupted by Mr. Handel Booth, who has shown himself as reluctant to allow Ministers to be asked questions, as he was anxious to cross-examine journalists, but to the credit of the Attorney-General he instantly brushed his over-zealous supporter aside like a fly. He had no objection to admitting having held shares in Welsh mines and other enterprises with which his brother, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, was connected, though according to Sir Rufus that brother had not "promoted a single company." He repeated that although a large number of Government Departments and Committees had participated in the negotiation of the Marconi Agreement he had never heard that such a contract was in contemplation until a few days before March 7. He was not in the Cabinet at the time and none of these matters came before him as a Law Officer, while he very rarely saw his brother, the Managing Director, and the latter realised that he did not wish to talk Marconi.

As regards "the announcement" of March last year, which has recently been made such a prominent feature of the controversy, though the announcement itself was not nearly as prominent at the time it is supposed to have been made, Sir Rufus Isaacs said: "What I knew from the Press was that the Marconi Company had issued a circular to their shareholders, which circular was published in the various organs of the Press on the morning of March 8." This is surely very different from Mr. Samuel's latest statement to the House of Commons (March 25) that the acceptance of the tender was "universally known" at the time.

As regards the "very trumpery affair" of the message to the Marconi banquet in New York despatched on March 17,* Sir Rufus Isaacs explained that the London correspondent

* See page 481.

of the *New York Times* telephoned to him at his house at Reading on Saturday, March 16, explaining that his journal was giving a "surprise" banquet to Mr. Marconi and my brother upon their arrival in New York, of which neither of them knew anything, and that "they wanted to get messages over the wires from people here in England so as to communicate with them at the table." At first he demurred, but was told that several public men had agreed to do so, including Lord Grey, Lord Avebury, Lord Blythe, Mr. Harry Lawson of the *Daily Telegraph*. Ultimately he consented, after being rung up a second time. Mr. Faber suggested that, looking back with the wisdom that comes after the event, it was surely unwise "for the Attorney-General of England, a member of his Majesty's Government, that Government having at that moment concluded a preliminary tender with the Marconi Company, to send a message . . . of that character booming the Marconi Company?" The witness replied: "I did not boom the Marconi Company. I must object to that. That, I think, is a gloss upon the telegram."

In view of the facts then I think there was nothing in it at all. If I was the only person who had sent a telegram, or if I had sent a telegram which was affecting the shares of that Company, or anything of that kind, that would be a different thing.

Q. You were the only member of the Government who sent a message? *A.* Because I happened to be the brother, no doubt.

Q. Exactly; you point my criticism—that you were in a dual capacity. *A.* Certainly.

Q. . . . Does it not occur to you as at any rate possible that the result of the speeches at the Marconi banquet and of the wireless messages, your own included, which were read out at that banquet, may have contributed to the subsequent rise in Marconi shares both at home and in New York. *A.* I should have thought it absolutely impossible.

When his telegram was received "there had already been the announcement of the successful conclusion of the negotiations between the British Government and the English Marconi Company. To suggest that my telegram or Lord Grey's telegram or anybody's telegram could have any effect when you had that announcement I confess is beyond me." This statement is interesting from another point of view, as indicating the prestige accruing to the Marconi Company through the capitulation of the British Post Office, which it is inconceivable should not have assisted them materially in their American enterprise.

In a graphic passage Sir Rufus said: "Just picture to yourself for a moment the effect upon a person's mind: you had the Government's acceptance of the contract; you had the Postmaster-General's acceptance on the 7th March of the tender. How on earth could a telegram by me congratulating them on the successful development have affected the market? If I am speaking a little heatedly, do not think I am complaining of your questions. What I am complaining of is the article," *i.e.* from the *Financial News* suggesting that such a message from a man in Sir Rufus Isaacs' position "was doubtless regarded both by the American public and by the United Wireless Telegraph Company as being practically, if not technically, a British Government endorsement of the Marconi undertaking."

Coming to April 9 (1912) when the brothers lunched together and Mr. Godfrey Isaacs made the attractive proposal declined by Sir Rufus, the latter repeated:

I saw no objection at all, but I had the feeling that I did not want to have any dealings with the Company, that is with the English Company.

Q. Why not? *A.* Because I preferred not.

Q. Because you did not think it quite right? *A.* No, it was not a question of its not being quite right.

Q. Because you did not think it quite right that in the circumstances of your position you should, on your brother's request, he being the Managing Director of the Marconi Company here, take shares in the American Marconi Company. Is that what you mean? *A.* I thought it was liable possibly to misconception.

Q. Do not you think so still? *A.* I thought so then.

Q. Why did you alter your mind later? *A.* I did not. I never altered my mind.

Q. Perhaps my mind is not marching so quickly as yours, but at first, when Mr. Godfrey Isaacs made this proposal to you and your brother Harry that you should take the shares, you said no, you thought you had better not? *A.* Yes.

Q. But later on you altered your mind and then took the shares? *A.* That is right. I altered my mind and the difference is important. In the one case I did not have any dealings at all with the Marconi Company; in the other, when I altered my mind as regards the purchase of shares, I dealt directly with my brother, who had nothing to do with the Marconi Company. That was the difference.

Q. That is with your brother Harry? *A.* Yes.

Q. Did you know then, or do you know now, where your brother got his American Marconi shares? *A.* Of course I did.

Q. From where? *A.* Undoubtedly he took some of the shares that were offered by the Company; that is by my brother Godfrey.

Q. Then does not it really come to the same thing? *A.* It seems to me to be very materially different.

Q. You agree to take shares from your brother Harry, your brother Harry in his

turn gets them either from Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director of the Marconi Company, or direct from the Marconi Company? *A.* Forgive me, is not the order just exactly the opposite?

Q. Will you tell me the order? *A.* He takes shares from the Company or from Mr. Godfrey Isaacs. He has bought the shares.

The witness insisted that there was a great distinction between what he refused to do with one brother and had actually done with the other, though the shares came from the same quarter.

Between the time of his rejecting the Marconi brother's offer and accepting that of the non-Marconi brother they had moved up in value owing to the American demand, and that was how he came to take 10,000 shares at £2 apiece, the opening price of which on the London Stock Exchange two days later was somewhere about 3¼, whence they moved up rapidly to nearly 4 and then slumped.

Q. If you had sold immediately the Stock Exchange opened on the 19th you could have made a profit of 1¼ on 10,000 shares. *A.* Yes.

Q. That is about £12,000? *A.* Yes. £12,500.

Q. That is a quick profit? *A.* Very.

It was a fortunate investment which he had to some extent taken advantage of, but he had never thought "to sell the shares whatever the price had gone to, but my idea was to lessen the price which I had paid for the shares, and to keep a balance of at least half . . ."

Q. Whom did you make your cheque payable to for the 10,000 shares? *A.* My brother Harry.

Q. They are bearers' certificates you have told us? *A.* With endorsements in blank. For all practical purposes you may call them bearers' certificates.

Q. They do not appear on any register? *A.* No.

Q. They passed from hand to hand? *A.* Yes, like all American shares.

Q. You paid him for them and he kept the shares? *A.* He did not get the shares until a long time afterwards.

Sir Rufus Isaacs' interest in the shares sold on April 19, counting another thousand sold on May 3, was 3570 out of the original 10,000, and the balance of 6430 was subsequently delivered to him. Then Mr. Faber turned to the colleagues' transaction, upon which it can hardly be said that there has been that frankness which is claimed by his admirers as among the most charming of Mr. Lloyd George's characteristics.

Q. Now will you tell me about Mr. Lloyd George and the Master of Elibank (as he

then was). You offered them 1000 shares each out of your 10,000 at the price you had given for them, namely £2? *A.* Yes.

Q. And they made you no payment? *A.* No.

Q. And they have not paid you up to now? *A.* No, the matter is just as it was.

Q. It was rather an unusual transaction, was it not? *A.* It did not strike me so. It was a transaction I simply engaged in with them as friends, and I ought to say that I am perfectly certain that neither of them would have bought the shares if it had not been from me. Whatever criticism there is to be directed to it at any rate it is criticism directed to me and not to them. . . .

Q. Did you know Aye or No whether they had sold any of their thousand shares on April 19. Do you know what they have done with their shares? *A.* They did nothing on April 19.

Q. How did you know they had done nothing, because they had the right to do what they pleased. *A.* I know that they did not. I told them exactly what I was proposing to do and what my idea was—that if the shares went up, certainly above £3, I should sell some of them in order to reduce the price of the balance which I intended to keep, and in what I was doing I quite understood it was left to me to do the same for them. I really was doing the whole transaction.

This led to misunderstanding, for Sir Rufus Isaacs, later on, in the course of a somewhat heated passage, casually mentioned that Mr. Lloyd George had sold a thousand shares, not on April 19 it is true but April 20.

One outstanding fact of the Marconi Mystery is that "big" politicians are essentially little men. The proof of their smallness is seen in their inability to admit that they have made a mistake, though human life, especially political human life, is made up of mistakes. But our Mandarins are infallible or nothing. When finally found out they invariably fall back upon cheap declamation against their "traducers." Sir Rufus Isaacs struggled from one impossible position to another, unable to establish the points to which he attached importance. If he had only the courage to say frankly: "Of course I recognise, considering my position as Attorney-General, before the negotiations for this contract were completed that I should at all costs have kept clear of all Marconi companies. It was idiotic to send that congratulatory telegram to the Marconi banquet in New York, and worse to buy the American shares and recommend them to my colleagues. I must have been mad to speak as I did in the House of Commons on October 11, and I know that I ought to have insisted on appearing at the first meeting of this Committee and make a

clean breast of the whole transaction. I am prepared to pay the price by retiring from the Government." Instead of which he continued his losing battle against the facts, insisting on the independence of the American and English Marconi Companies, denying that his telegram could conceivably have had any effect in booming either of them or that he himself had had any advantage over the general public in purchasing American Marconi shares at £2 on April 17 on the strength of information from the Managing Director of the British Marconi Company and the reorganiser of the American Marconi Company on April 9, whereas the general public could only get in at £3 5s. on April 19, the evidence showing that even at that price ordinary applicants obtained but a small proportion of the shares they desired. At one moment, as we have seen, Sir Rufus Isaacs would attribute the prosperity of the British Marconi Company to the Government contract, while at another he said that "there has been the greatest misapprehension with regard to that." "The big rise in the English Company's Marconi shares roughly from £5 to £9 and upwards, as I understand, had nothing whatever to do with the contract." That rise was due to the arrangements

> that were being made in America with reference to the American enterprise, because it was quite well known that the English Company held a large interest in the American Company, and consequently if the American Company was going to do well, and was making good arrangements there would naturally be a rise in the shares of the English Company. You could deal in the one where you could not in the other, and naturally a large number of orders for purchases were sent from America, as appears from our financial papers, buying the English shares because of the arrangements which were made in America, one, the purchase of the assets of the United Wireless Company, and two, the Western Union Cable arrangements, and of course the winning or the complete disposal favourably to the American Marconi Company of the patent action which established, as I understand, the validity of their patents there as they had established them here. Those were the three important factors which sent the price up from £5 to £9 and upwards, and had nothing whatever to do with the contract. When I say nothing whatever to do with it, that may be putting it a little too high perhaps.

Surely that completely destroys the legend of the Coalition Press as to the independence of the fortunes of the American and the British Marconi Companies. It shows their relations to be interdependent and intimate, as has been steadily maintained in these pages. In order that there may be no mistake

as to Sir Rufus Isaacs' standpoint at this stage of his evidence, he reiterated, "But what I was saying was that the material rise to which you directed attention of £5 10s. to £9 10s. (i.e. British Marconis) was in my view (and I am speaking more from knowledge that I have obtained by reference to various newspapers of contemporaneous date) in consequence of these three points of development in the American Company, which, of course, made the English Company worth so much more."

This is not everybody's interpretation of the boom, but Sir Rufus Isaacs was entitled to his opinion. Mr. Campbell, the broker of the Marconi, later on expressed the same opinion. "If you look at the quotations of the rise in the price of the English shares they very nearly absolutely synchronise with the rise in the price of all the shares in the subsidiary companies, and that was the main reason that induced people to buy the shares. They thought very little in the market—and I think you will find the price bears it out at that time—of the Government contract at all." This may be correct, though it nullifies the assumption endorsed by Mr. Marconi himself that the great event of the year in the history of the Marconi Company was the agreement made with the British Government in March, and incidentally the famous "six weeks after the announcement of that contract" collapses, together with many other kindred statements. However, it is really difficult for any conscientious student of the Mystery to follow the varying Marconi arguments. At one moment, as we have seen, the Company owes its powerful position in the United States to the contract with the British Government and congratulatory messages from Attorneys-General counted for nothing, the next moment the contract counts for nothing in the appreciation of shares which is exclusively attributed to American developments. You may pay your dollar and take your choice. At any rate, here was Sir Rufus Isaacs, supported by the broker in belittling the value of the contract to the Company, declaring that "the mere fact that they (the British Marconi Company) had not obtained the Government contract would not injure them . . . that is shown by the fact that when they repudiated the contract in consequence of the delay, I think I am right in saying that their shares did not fall but rose."

Mr. Handel Booth obligingly endeavoured to prevent the Attorney-General from producing his pass books on the somewhat invidious ground that he was a "distinguished witness," and certainly Mr. Handel Booth appeared to be overawed by his presence, as he had lost all that gusto which made him so cheerful a combatant when obscure journalists were testifying. However, he was wisely brushed aside by the witness, who offered no objection whatsoever. Happily tragedies have their humorous side, and the subsequent cross-examination or rather re-examination by Mr. Falconer supplied the comic element.

Q. It [*i.e.* the American Company) was a company in which the strictest purist in these matters might have been pleased to have an interest ? *A.* So far as I was aware, yes.

Q. Any member of the House ? *A.* Oh, yes.

Q. Or any member of the Bar or the Bench. I am putting it in the most absolute way ? *A.* Quite.

Q. To make it clear, because it is a little difficult to realise after all that has been said—or the highest dignitaries in the Church who had money to invest might properly have made an investment in the American Marconi Company ? *A.* I should have thought so.

Q. Having heard all that you have heard, are you able to see any reason, *apart from the fact of your being in the Government* [my italics], if I may put that in the first place, any ground upon which (again I use the words) the strictest purist in those matters could take any exception to the manner in which the purchase was made ? *A.* No, I do not know that any exception has been taken, certainly in my view it could not be.

Sir Rufus was unweary in explaining away his speech in the House of Commons and in emphasising his regret at the prolonged postponement of his appearance before the Committee, while his critics had given him no chance of going to law until the publication in *Le Matin*. Mr. Falconer gently suggested : "Of course, you must realise that the announcement that you had acquired shares in the American Company was one then (*i.e.* in the *Matin* case) made for the first time ? " To which Sir Rufus Isaacs significantly replied : "Yes, *made public*" [my italics]. Mr. Falconer's astonishment at the American transaction was admirable. He added : "And as we have been sitting here discussing the agreement and the English Company to the extent of thirty-nine or forty meetings and nothing has ever been heard of the American Company, you realise that it came as a surprise to the public and

to the House that you had held those shares—I do not say rightly or wrongly, but as a matter of fact?" Observe the Attorney-General's answer: "A surprise, yes. I do not know how far it was known. I do not mean to members of the Committee, of course; I am not suggesting that." This answer was given before the more illuminating "certainly" in reply to the enquiry as to whether Sir Rufus Isaacs had informed members of the Committee of the American transaction.

Why should not the Attorney-General be allowed to say at what date he informed members of the Select Committee and which members of the Committee of the American transaction? Possibly his answer might help to explain why the Committee has, so to speak, been "kept off the grass." We must get to the bottom of this intrigue.

Additional emphasis was laid on the openness of the American transaction.

Q. And there was no attempt at concealment in that? *A*. Every clerk in the office would know of them; that is to say, every clerk who saw the books and accounts and contract note and so forth.

Q. And nothing to the contrary was ever suggested? *A*. Oh no.

Q. As a matter of fact, a definite statement to that effect had not appeared in any of the papers which were devoting so much attention to the subject? *A*. That is so.

We are now approaching the stage when it becomes almost a reflection on the *Outlook* and the *National Review* that they were unable to publish facsimiles of contract notes or cheques that may have passed from Sir Rufus Isaacs' brokers to himself or from Sir Rufus Isaacs to his brothers or bankers.

It is still Mr. Falconer who speaks. "*Q*. Therefore, the public did not know. Apart from the fact that the public were not aware, is there anything of which complaint can be made with regard to your not having taken action or not having met in the House charges which had not been made." We like this Scotch humour, though whether it appealed to the witness we cannot say. He replied: "I do not think so, because the fact that it has not been stated earlier is my misfortune, not my fault. It is because I thought the proper place to meet them was here in the Committee. I have been waiting from week to week to come before the Committee." Though why Mr. Falconer or Sir Rufus Isaacs should care to waste the time

of the Committee on a transaction in which they were mutually agreed that any purist might have participated may be intelligible to the reader, but is quite unintelligible to the writer.

The Attorney-General was then taken in hand by Lord Robert Cecil, whom no one has accused of prejudice or partiality. He was tremendously down on journalists on the subject of Rumours, but he was not afraid to tackle Ministers on Speculations, as appeared to be the case with the "majority" of the Committee, and the impossible position of Ministers became more obvious as the contest of wits proceeded. When he sent his telegram to the *New York Times* he had no idea of any commercial connection between that newspaper and the Marconi Company, as he was ignorant of the fact that it had been receiving its news by Marconigram, and he reiterated what he had often said before that his telegram could in no way strengthen the position of the Marconi Company in New York. Once more the "contract" of March comes into the picture, and this line of argument is interesting as contrasted with other lines already referred to. Sir Rufus Isaacs told Lord Robert Cecil:

> I should have thought it (*i.e.* the English Marconi Company) was as strong as it possibly could be made before they went out (*i.e.* to New York). If they wanted to make that Company appear strong, could they get anything stronger than to say that the Postmaster-General, the responsible head of the telegraphs in this country, had accepted the tender which they had offered. That I should have thought was far stronger than anything that could be got from anybody else. That is putting it as high as you can possibly put it. I dare say they used it. I do not know whether they did or not, but I can quite conceive that that put the Company as regards this Government in the strongest position and certainly in a stronger position than it could be from a congratulatory telegram of mine.

Sir Rufus Isaacs modestly belittles the importance of such a message from the English Attorney-General on the eve of the great American development, though he here recognises that the English Marconi Company derived immense advantage from their contract with the British Government which might be useful to them in the United States, and, as the main result of their pilgrimage was the evolution of the American Marconi Company, is it open for an intelligent man to continue to maintain that the American Marconi Company was an absolutely independent development which had not the faintest interest direct or indirect in the contractual relations of its parent with the British Government?

Sir Rufus Isaacs fought hard against the suggestion that he had any advantage over the general public in buying shares from one brother at £2 on the strength of inside information from another brother who moreover supplied the shares to the vendor. His 10,000 shares were a part of 50,000 which Mr. Harry Isaacs had taken from his brother Godfrey Isaacs, who at that time retained 100,000 of the 500,000 he had undertaken to "place." But Mr. Godfrey Isaacs did not as might have been anticipated keep the other 50,000, which he distributed among various people, and there was no pooling arrangement between the brothers, though Sir Rufus appears to have imagined that his brother Godfrey "was in some other arrangement," though this does not appear to have been the case as the latter told the Committee that he only kept 2500 of his original 500,000 and made a present to the Marconi Company of nearly £50,000 which he might justly have claimed. The whole transaction is exceedingly complicated like the relations between the brothers, for example, Sir Rufus Isaacs' 10,000 shares had been bought by Harry from Godfrey for about £10,000 on April 9, and was sold to Sir Rufus at a profit of between £9000 and £10,000 only a few days later, because although Mr. Harry was prepared to take less Sir Rufus insisted that that was the proper price at that date as they had gone up in the interval. No documents passed between the brothers, though on June 28, 1912, Mr. Harry Isaacs wrote as follows:

DEAR RUFUS,

After completing American settlement your interest in sales is 3570 shares sold at an average of about £3 6s. 6d.—total £11,870 5s. This leaves £8129 15s. for the remaining 6430 shares, on which your cost is reduced to about £1 5s. 3d. per share. You need not bother about money. Will let you know when wanting any.

Yours,

HARRY.

Lord Robert Cecil next elicited the curious fact of which Sir Rufus Isaacs gave a very elaborate explanation, that he only paid this cheque of £8129 15s. on January 6, 1913, among other reasons given being that when the Attorney-General came home in October "there was, of course, the Debate and then my intention was not to pay for them at all until I had been before the Committee. The view that I took was that I wanted as far as I could to preserve the *status quo* as it was when the rumours

started, so that nothing should happen after July of 1912, when I first heard of the rumours, if I could have kept it." *But the rumours as we have heard ad nauseam only concerned British Marconis.* Then by the end of the year, "as I had not been called, and my brother was going abroad and he had the shares, I thought I could not go on waiting for ever to pay it, and I said, 'You had better let me have the shares before you go and I will pay for them,' and I paid then the £8129 15s." Here one feels completely out of one's depth, so it is better to leave the matter as it stands. Sir Rufus Isaacs had a desperate tussle with Lord Robert Cecil, from whom he unavailingly sought to secure an interim certificate of character, but the latter preferred to elicit the facts as being the real business in hand.

Q. Let us return, after that interlude, to the actual subject of the enquiry. How many shares did your brother Mr. Harry Isaacs sell? *A.* It is the relation of 4 to 1. It is a question of simply multiplying the 3570.

Q. Not quite, because you sold 8000 yourself? *A.* That made no difference.

Q. I want to know how many he sold? *A.* I see what you mean. It must be somewhere about 11,000.

Q. The figures I have worked out bring it to about 9000, but I dare say you are right. I make out that between you you sold 17,850 shares, or something of that kind. *A.* That may be right.

Q. Taking the whole 50,000 shares together they were obtained by your brother at just over par as you have told us? *A.* Yes.

Q. That came to £53,000 or thereabouts? *A.* Yes, thereabouts—not quite so much.

Q. Of that amount 17,850 were sold at an average price of £3 6s. 6d.? *A.* Yes.

Q. My arithmetic brings that to about £59,500. I do not know whether that is right? *A.* Yes.

Q. So that there was a gain on the 50,000 shares of £6000, though I understand you did not have that gain? *A.* Certainly there was.

Q. As a matter of fact, owing to the fact that you paid your brother £9000 on the balance? *A.* £8129 15s. . . .

Q. Do not you think that was rather an unusual transaction as between brothers—that you should pay him another £9000 beyond what he paid? *A.* In view of what had taken place not at all.

Q. You do not think that. *A.* No. . . .

Q. It was a very large transaction, no doubt. Your brother may be a very wealthy man? *A.* Not such a very large transaction—the transaction at £1 was not.

Q. £50,000? *A.* It was not a very large transaction in those shares at the time. I should not think so.

Ordinary persons will share the opinion of Lord Robert Cecil

that £50,000 is a very large sum of money, but to the Radical Plutocracy it is evidently a mere bagatelle. Note also the profitableness of the transaction, as the proceeds of the sale of the 17,850 shares was actually £6000 more than the original cost of the 50,000. Also, Sir Rufus Isaacs' loss of which we have heard so much remained in the family, to whom it was a substantial gain thanks to the large cheque, if such a term be appropriate to the sum of £8129 15s., which was only paid up this year.

Lord Robert Cecil afforded Sir Rufus Isaacs yet another opportunity of acknowledging that he had dealt unfairly with the House of Commons and the public in not making a frank and full disclosure of all speculations in any Marconi Company in his notorious speech. But there are none so blind as those who will not see, and the Attorney-General was obdurate. He repeated that it was unnecessary to refer to the American transaction because he was only dealing with specific charges—selected by the way by himself—and because he was a member of the Government moving for the appointment of a Select Committee before which he expected to appear "at a very early date." Again, "as one of the members of the Government" he had insisted upon the Committee being appointed to investigate these very matters, so that then the House of Commons would get the whole facts before them, and could examine and cross-examine me as they desired and thought fit."

Lord Robert Cecil: At any rate you will agree with me so far that it would have been perfectly in order for you to have made this statement on that occasion? *A.* I do not think it would have been relevant, but I do not think it would have been out of order in a parliamentary sense.

Q. It would have been relevant in this sense, that this was a motion for the appointment of a Committee with a very general reference, and therefore, it would have been relevant for you to make any statement? *A.* I do not mean that it would not have been relevant in a parliamentary sense. I agree it would not have been out of order, but I say it would not have been relevant to the charges which had been made and with which I was dealing—charges which had been going on for months.

Q. And you did propose to state all this to the Committee? *A.* Certainly.

Q. I do not really quite understand why if you thought it was relevant to state it to the Committee, it was not relevant to state it to the House of Commons, which was discussing the resolution for the appointment of the Committee? *A.* It appears to me very simple. There was no question on that Debate as to whether or not the Committee should be appointed. There was no question on that Debate of informing

the House of Commons of such facts that might lead the House of Commons to say, "Well, on balance, and on consideration of all the facts, we think it better that a Committee should be appointed," then I could quite understand it being relevant if you like. But what was happening was that the Government itself had insisted upon the Committee. The Government had put down the motion. The only point of the Debate—and you were present, I know, and have the Debate in mind—was these charges; there really was nothing else in the Debate.

Q. Oh? *A.* You are right in one sense. I am dealing with the personal part of it, but of course there is the question whether it was right to enter into the contract from a business aspect. But I brush that aside because it has nothing to do with the matter that we are discussing. The point, in so far as it affected Ministers, was the charges that had been made, and you have no doubt had all the argument.

Q. It was rather more than that; it was the general atmosphere of suspicion, and talk and rumours, and things of that kind? *A.* In reference to certain particular things. The general atmosphere, so far as I know, was an atmosphere which was created by various journals. Whether I am right or wrong I do not know, but that is how I understand it, and it is possible there may have been talk. Of course, there is always talk at clubs and in drawing-rooms, and no doubt there was gossip of that kind. Assume all that, the talk was always of one character: it never was anything else, up to this moment in March 1913.

Q. That is your impression? *A.* I have never heard any suggestion to the contrary. If there is any other I would like to know, but I have never heard up to this moment or in any of the evidence before you, a suggestion of anything else than these rumours, that we—that is, some other Ministers or Minister and myself—had made large profits—or profits, I care nothing about the size of them—out of the negotiations which had been going on before the acceptance of the contract. I have never, so far as I know—you will correct me if I am wrong—heard the faintest suggestion of dealings after the contract. I have never heard the faintest suggestion of impropriety in dealings in the American Company. I have never heard of anything of the kind up to this moment.

Public attention should be riveted on this statement of the Attorney-General, which without extravagance may surely be interpreted as signifying not, as has previously been imagined, that no Ministers were at any time entitled to speculate in any Marconi shares, but that from March 1912 onwards any Minister could with perfect propriety speculate to their heart's content in any Marconi Company. Coupled with the refusal of the Prime Minister to enquire as to the speculations of his colleagues this statement casts grave suspicion on the Government because it encourages the public to believe that though there may have been no Marconi speculations before March—and the oath of every member of the Government would be required on this point—there may have been any number of "investments"

after March. The question has become much too big to be hushed up either by Jewish influences on the Press, by Select Committees, or by Parliament itself; the whole thing must be probed to the bottom, and the Asquith Ministry be individually cross-examined now that the disclaimers put forward on their behalf last October are seen to be worth as little as the breath with which they were spoken.

Sir Rufus Isaacs had now reached the stage of expressing surprise that his American investments were not better known. We feel keenly the imputation on the enterprise of our profession. "I have no doubt a great many people knew—I cannot conceive that a great many people did not know—that there had been dealings after the event in the American Company, but that was no use to the persons who were building up these charges of slander, because the moment they stated the foundation of the rumours they destroyed the case they were making, and that is why I am very anxious that the Committee should bear in mind when it comes to investigate these rumours that were circulated." Lord Robert Cecil was hardly to be put off in this fashion, and he again brought the Attorney-General back to the rumours in circulation at the time of the Debate, and that it was with a view to disposing of them that the Debate took place. But Sir Rufus Isaacs would not have it. "I did not think so. I thought that it offered an opportunity for me to get up and deny in the House of Commons, the first time that I had the opportunity, the stories which so far as I knew were in circulation. If there was any other, surely somebody would have stated it in the House of Commons to me at the time to give me the opportunity of denying it." In other words it is a reproach to other members that last October they did not get up in their places in Parliament and inform the speculative section of the Cabinet that they had bought certain shares in Marconi Companies at such and such dates.

Q. But surely the Debate was also with a view of calming and disabusing the public mind. That was the real purpose? *A.* Certainly; and in so far as there were statements of this character made I thought I had disabused it; at any rate I dealt with them.

Q. Surely the object of your speech was generally to disabuse the public mind and

satisfy them that there was no kind of ground for any suspicion as to the conduct of any Minister in the matter? *A.* I think so now.

Q. Do not you think now, looking back, it would have been wiser and better if you had then and there told them all this story?

No one can say that the Attorney-General was not given every opportunity of retiring from a false position, but he would not take it, contenting himself with observing that if he had then known "that it would be six months' time before I should be called and have my opportunity of making the statement, I should agree with you, but not if you had told me then that I should be called within a very short period, as I naturally expected, as I explained the other day." This tedious reiteration makes it all the more necessary after what has happened that the country, to whom, after all, salaried Members of Parliament and over-paid Ministers are peculiarly amenable, should know precisely what communications passed from the Government or from any member of the Government, directly or indirectly, to selected members of the Select Committee concerning any Ministerial speculation in any Marconi Company during any period of the negotiations between the parent Company and the Government. This is now the crux of the problem, and should the Government refuse to give the information, the country will know what to think and will be justified in believing that there are infinitely worse things behind the scenes than any of those which have been allowed into the limelight.

The Prime Minister himself is already sufficiently compromised and further and better particulars are desirable as to his position and knowledge, and what efforts he may have made to divert the Committee from doing its duty at the earliest possible moment, as also to what extent Jackals taking his name in vain may have exerted sinister influence.

LORD ROBERT CECIL: As we heard from the Prime Minister last night, you had told the Prime Minister about this?

SIR RUFUS ISAACS: Yes, I knew that the Prime Minister knew, as soon as the rumours started.

Q. You did think it right to tell him about this particular transaction the moment you heard of any rumours? *A.* Yes, I think it was almost before I heard of the rumours—before I heard at any rate that there were rumours in the Lobby—the Master of Elibank, Lord Murray, told me that he had heard them and that he had

told the Prime Minister what the Prime Minister said yesterday (i.e. that he, Mr. Asquith, was informed in July of the first American deal).

Q. That was when? *A.* That was in July, I think it must have been towards the end of July, because it was just about the time that the motions on the paper dealing with the ratification, and the reason for that was to a large extent that there were rumours affecting Ministers, and that members of the House of Commons wanted to deal with those rumours which were then said to be crystallised into shape in articles in journals.

Q. That being so, you thought it right to tell the Prime Minister? *A.* Yes.

Q. You did not think it irrelevant then? *A.* Nor, as I have told you, should I have thought it irrelevant if I had come before the Committee; on the contrary, I should have thought that the proper place to tell the whole story.

Q. Did you tell the Postmaster-General? *A.* Yes, immediately.

Q. Did you tell him personally yourself? *A.* Immediately.

Q. What do you mean by "immediately"? *A.* Immediately I heard the rumours in July.

Q. At the end of July? *A.* Yes, just about the same time I am telling you of now.

Q. Did any writing pass between you and either of your colleagues? *A.* Which colleagues do you mean?

Q. The Prime Minister or the Postmaster-General? *A.* Yes, certainly, writing passed between the Prime Minister and me.

Q. Is there any objection to one seeing that? *A.* I am afraid the difficulty is that you cannot, I am sorry to say.

Sir Rufus Isaacs explained that it was destroyed. "I will tell you at once how it arose. It is very much better that you should know. First of all, at the end of July, the Master of Elibank had told the Prime Minister. I had myself told Mr. Herbert Samuel." The inquisitive reader will ask in passing why all this telling as there was nothing to tell? American Marconis had no more connection with British Marconis than the Baltimore Railway had. However, they began to tell. "I had myself told Mr. Herbert Samuel. I do not mean by that that he knew all the details. What I told him was that I had bought American shares and that the Master of Elibank and Mr. Lloyd George had an interest with me, and I told him they had nothing to do with the contract; that the shares were bought some time after the contract had been announced, and they had nothing to do with the English Company, in this sense certainly—that they had no interest in the profits of the English Company or in the contract."

One can picture the astonishment of Mr. Herbert Samuel, the Postmaster-General, who was reponsible for the contract

on learning from one of his colleagues who had nothing to do with it that a transaction in April was "some time after the contract had been announced," because we know that Mr. Samuel himself never varied from the view that there was no contract at that time and the unfortunate public are only too well aware that there was no "announcement" save by the circular to the Marconi shareholders. The reader who peruses this meagre and misleading document will be amazed, if he is still capable of amazement, that British Cabinet Ministers should at this time of day describe it as an "announcement" whereas last spring the Postmaster-General "announced" nothing to the House of Commons because there was nothing to announce! The Attorney-General added that in the beginning of August Mr. Samuel sent him a letter with a copy of the *Eye-Witness* calling attention to various suggestions and insinuations "of a very gross character" upon which he wrote to consult the Prime Minister as to whether any steps should be taken, describing the common Ministerial venture in the American Marconi shares, but unfortunately his letter had been destroyed or mislaid. But subsequently Mr. Asquith's reply was forthcoming.

It was dated August 15, 1912. "My dear Rufus" was informed by his Chief: "I have read carefully this scurrilous rubbish, and I am clearly of opinion that you should take no notice of it. Samuel gives some excellent reasons in his letter (which had been forwarded to the Prime Minister). I suspect that the *Eye-Witness* has a very meagre circulation. I notice only one page of advertisements, and that occupied entirely by Belloc's publishers. A prosecution would secure notoriety and might bring in subscribers."

Innocents might have thought that as the single desire of Ministers was to vindicate their fame they would have rejoiced at the opportunity afforded by the *Eye-Witness* and would have risked adding to its advertisements or subscriptions for the sake of saving themselves. Is it certain that their decision was not coloured by the fact that in cross-examination the *Eye-Witness* might have ascertained disagreeable information jealously concealed from the world until the *Matin* case? Sir Rufus Isaacs also informed the Committee that he likewise considered the desirability of suing

"every one" of the other newspapers which had criticised him. Lord Robert Cecil asked:

Have you been advised about it, or have you relied on your own judgment in the matter? *A.* I have been advised also.

Q. Professionally? *A.* I never feel too confident about my own judgment where my personal interests are concerned and I have generally consulted friends. I did not take formal legal opinion, but I have consulted friends, certainly those well versed and experienced in these matters.

He would not say that "a prosecution might not lie" against the *Eye-Witness*, "but with regard to the others I could not find anything definite; it was mere insinuation and suggestion. I thought that the *Eye-Witness* went rather further than that," but in that particular instance he was governed by the opinion of the Prime Minister and Mr. Herbert Samuel. The reason that he had not told the whole story in the *Matin* case was that there would be no time and no cross-examination, and the reason the action had been brought against the *Matin* was because there had been such a long delay in getting before the Select Committee, and the *Matin* made specific charges for which it could be brought to book.

XIII. ANOTHER REVELATION

Mr. Macmaster then took up the running and once more Sir Rufus Isaacs discussed his American transaction almost as though it were a matter of public notoriety, needing no disclosure in the House of Commons. "It was not a question of making a disclosure; I had no objection to anybody knowing about the American shares. I have never made a secret of the American shares. It was not an objection (obligation ?), but I did not consider that it arose. My point was to deny the statement which had been made which affected my honour." Later on concerning this transaction, "As I have told you a number of persons knew all about it." Sir Rufus Isaacs ended the day by declaiming against Mr. Amery, who not unnaturally suggested that even iniquitous editors might have got wind of facts so widely known.

"*Q*. And that may have been the whole origin of all the rumours ?"

For some mysterious reason this was like a red rag to a bull. The Attorney-General was beside himself with fury and in the midst of his outburst he let another enormous cat out of the Ministerial bag. "I understand that view, but may I point out to you that, as I have said before, in my view that is impossible. Any person who knew I had sold 8000 shares in my name, *or that Mr. Lloyd George had sold a thousand shares in his name, which he did* [my italics], any person who knew those things, and who relied upon them in any way as basing these rumours was undoubtedly guilty of as wicked an act as possible." Persons who heard this dramatic demonstration were divided between amazement at Sir Rufus Isaacs' fury with journalists who might have regarded a great speculation in Marconi shares long concealed from the public as about as discreditable as any act a Minister could commit, and stupefaction by his announcement, premeditated or unpremeditated, that Mr. Lloyd George had sold a thousand

American shares, because up to that moment the entire transaction was understood to have remained—because we were told it had remained—in the hands of Sir Rufus Isaacs himself. And as no cross-examination by counsel was permitted by the Committee let me say, as one of the objects of this demonstration, that after carefully reading what has appeared in Ministerial organs and Ministerial evidence, I am totally unable to discover that distinction between a speculation in British Marconi shares and an "investment" in American Marconi shares, which we are asked to believe is the difference between black and white. If the companies be not one and indivisible their interests are difficult to distinguish. They are run by the same people, inspired by the same object, namely to acquire a world-wide monopoly of wireless telegraphy, of which the British Marconi Company would be one link and the American Marconi another link. This is not a case of being wise after the event because in the studiously neglected passage of the *National Review* of October the American boom was singled out as one of the most scandalous episodes in the whole business and the names of Ministers were mentioned in connection with it. Judging by the Government's present attitude may it not be assumed that there are other transactions still to be disclosed, though when, where, or by whom I will not venture to predict.

At the end of a long day's cross-examination Sir Rufus Isaacs, who had stood the strain much worse than many witnesses upon whom he has practised, indulged in a brilliant display of pyrotechnics as an injured innocent whose spotless character wicked and malicious men had endeavoured to blacken. Doubtless this sort of thing goes down with lachrymose politicians and journalists and it was duly written up by the faithful next day. But more serious people were arrested by the startling revelation that the belief encouraged by the evidence in the *Matin* case, as well as that before the Select Committee, that a full disclosure had been made of all Ministerial transactions in American Marconi shares, supposed to be confined to the one purchase of 10,000 shares by Sir Rufus Isaacs from Mr. Harry Isaacs at £2 apiece, in which Mr. Lloyd George and the Master of Elibank had shared to the extent of 1000 shares—was erroneous. When it became known that Sir Rufus

Isaacs had said: "Any person who knew I had sold 8000 shares in my name, *or that Mr. Lloyd George had sold* 1000 *shares in his name, which he did*, any person who knew those things and who relied upon them in any way as basing these rumours was undoubtedly guilty of as wicked an act as possible" —further fat was in the fire, and even the much enduring Coalition Press could ill-conceal its irritation at having another unpleasant surprise sprung upon it by revered Ministers. When Mr. Amery enquired next day (March 28) whether Sir Rufus Isaacs had "anything to say on that," the latter replied: "Nothing except that it is correct." Here was another first-class sensation. Lord Robert Cecil observed: "It was news to some members of the Committee that Mr. Lloyd George had sold a thousand shares in his name. That is so, is it? *A.* Certainly." The witness added that he had discovered in reference to a question, which will be found on a previous page, that "I might have given an answer as if I did not understand the question. I am not sure the question is correctly stated, but I raised no point about it, and I wanted to make a statement at the end, and I therefore asked the Chairman to allow me to do so at the end, which I thought was the proper time." His Majesty's present Ministers seem to be poor judges of the proper time for making statements, as the reader will be inclined to agree after referring back to p. 514, on which he will find Mr. Faber's very clear question and Sir Rufus Isaacs' answer, which conveyed the idea that the chapter of American Revelations was closed. It was also in accordance with the impression erroneously conveyed in the *Matin* case, namely, that there had been one and only one purchase. However, as this second transaction was also a loss —what very bad men of business these Ministers are considering all the advantages they enjoy over ordinary mortals—the Coalition Press again resolved to make the best of a bad job. Though they couldn't like it they could at any rate lump it. Sir Rufus explained. "I understood the question as relating to April 19, and I made the note that I thought that without stating something that I knew of on April 20, it might not convey the complete answer, and therefore I was going to call Mr. Faber's attention to it so that he could put any further questions that he desired upon the subject." What would

Mr. Falconer have said had Mr. Lawson produced such an explanation, and what insinuations would have been made upon his character by Mr. Handel Booth, who was so active and lively in those happy days, but is now in a state of profound and permanent dejection. Sir Rufus added:

If the question had been directed to me as to whether I knew what they had done with their shares, instead of, as I thought it was, did they sell on the 19th not 20th April a thousand shares which they held independently—when I say that, I mean which were the half which were in any case to be kept as an investment of the 2000 which they had, the same as my own—I should have said that they sold, to my knowledge, a thousand through a broker in the ordinary way, with a contract note in the ordinary way, to Mr. Lloyd George, and, I believe, through his usual brokers, just as he had done with every other transaction. That is what I had in my mind.

This provoked Lord Robert Cecil to make the remark rising to the lips of everybody attempting to decipher this monkey puzzle. "I do not quite follow exactly now what was the state of things? *A.* I was dealing with it a little elliptically, thinking you had in mind exactly what I said. . . . You will remember I told you that as to the shares which had been bought, the intention was, if the market went high, to sell a part of them, but never exceeding one-half, so as to reduce the price which we paid for the other half which were to be kept as an investment." So it was not all investment. "Mr. Lloyd George, or the Master of Elibank, had nothing whatever to do, and were going to have nothing whatever to do with any sales which I might make to reduce the price; but Mr. Lloyd George on the 20th (of April), when the market was somewhere about 3¼—they were quite high—told me that his broker had very strongly advised him to sell and said that he thought the market was much too high." Mr. Lloyd George, who throughout showed infinitely inferior intelligence to his broker, and in the public interests we only wish that his broker were Chancellor of the Exchequer *vice* Mr. Lloyd George, "said he was going to keep them, and the broker thought it was ridiculous to keep them at this price, that they could not possibly hold the price, and urged him very strongly to sell." Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer once more beset the Attorney-General asking him, "if there was any objection to his selling. I said: 'Well, as regards these thousand shares of yours and the Master of Elibank you can do what you

please with them; sell them if you like, or keep them if you like'—and he told me then that he had sold a thousand shares at a little over £3." Lord Robert Cecil explained that why he could not quite follow it was because when he had asked the witness on a previous day (Question 480): "You sold your 3570 shares and that actual transaction gave you a profit of something between £4000 and £5000? *A*. Yes, a little more, but that is near enough." Upon which the questioner had observed: "And of that, according to the way you were treating the transaction, you regarded something between 400 and 500 as belonging to Mr. Lloyd George and between 400 and 500 as belonging to the Master of Elibank." To which Sir Rufus Isaacs had answered, "That is right," and he reiterated: "That is my answer now. That is right."

Still Lord Robert Cecil was unable to follow, because if Mr. Lloyd George had sold the thousand shares of which they had just heard for the first time, "how was he still interested in the result of your sale?" I give the answer of the Attorney-General:

> I see what you mean. It was because of this. I had nothing to do with his sale of a thousand shares; it mattered not to me. That was entirely his affair—that is his and the Master of Elibank's. I was dealing with a question you put to me as to what happened with regard to the shares in respect to which, of course, I had to account to the Master of Elibank and to Mr. Lloyd George for one-tenth each. That was the position. The settlement did not come until the 20th June. By the 20th June he and the Master of Elibank had bought shares at something like 2¼—and they held them—of the same broker, in the same way, in Mr. Lloyd George's name, in the contract note; and you will see the result of that was that they had sold and bought, and of course all that happened was that they had to pay and take up in the same way the balance of those shares. The result was that I had not to deliver to them the thousand. Is it clear to you?

It is not very clear, though if we start from the bold assumption that our Chancellor of the Exchequer sold "a bear" of American Marconis, *i.e.* shares which he had not got at over £3 and subsequently bought them back when they had fallen to 2¼, it becomes as plain as a pike-staff; but as it is now part of the accepted Radical creed to regard Mr. Lloyd George as an investor and not a gambler, it is considered almost as wicked to accuse him of selling "a bear" as it was two months ago to accuse him of buying a "bull." In any event he "sold a pup" to the House of Commons.

Sir Rufus Isaacs laboured to make plain to the Committee

exactly what had happened and he may have succeeded, though I frankly confess to be unable to make head or tail of the explanation, except as I have said on the elementary assumption, which I am inclined to think is true, that Mr. Lloyd George in conjunction with the Master of Elibank joined the noble army of "bears" and were lucky enough, if for this occasion only, to buy at a high price and sell at a low price. Or Mr. Lloyd George may in City parlance have "ratted on the pool." Sir Rufus Isaacs was, however, very insistent and subtle. In any case there is no dispute as to the independent purchase of 3000 American Marconi shares by Mr. Lloyd George and the Master of Elibank on May 22 at $2\frac{5}{32}$.

Mr. George Faber reminded the witness that he had replied, "I really was doing the whole transaction," to which Sir Rufus answered: "That is quite right." *Q.* Then in the light of our present knowledge, when you said "I was really doing the whole transaction," that meant your 10,000 shares including their 2000? *A.* Yes, I think it appears to if you read it.

Q. And you did not intend in any way then to refer to the 3000 which they apparently bought subsequently on their own account? *A.* The three thousand, no; I was not referring to that at all.

Q. No, you were confining yourself to the deal which they had done with you? *A.* Quite so.

Q. And you were not extending your answer to the other shares which you knew, when you made that answer, that they had had on their own account? *A.* I am not quite sure what you mean by that. Are you suggesting that I was not telling you purposely?

Q. No, no; I only want to get at the fact? *A.* I agree with you in the fact.

Q. I do not want to have any heat. I only want the information? *A.* I am perfectly sure about that, but let me say my great anxiety has been to state those acts. My difficulty has been always that it has been said with regard to me, "That is a matter which is not of your doing; you have no concern with it and consequently you are not entitled to state it." I was most anxious in *Le Matin* case to state the whole of the facts with regard to this, because I thought if it could be done it was much better from every point of view that whatever there was to be said should be said, and I wanted to tell the whole story.

Every one will heartily applaud the desire of the Attorney-General and as poignantly regret its failure to materialise, which was thus explained:

But unfortunately, as a lawyer will see, I could not state it because it was not a matter that I had had to do with; it was simply stating what had been told to me in regard to the transactions of persons not concerned in the libel action. Therefore, after

consultation with my counsel who considered the whole matter and before whom all these facts were put—and I must say also according to my own view—as I had to be particular as Attorney-General, that I should not in any way strain the laws of evidence when I was giving this evidence in my own case—we came to the conclusion that we must leave it until we came before the Committee.

Simple folk are completely out of their depth as is continually the case throughout the great Marconi Mystery. No one has attempted to explain why the American transaction was ever brought into the *Matin* case, and yet we are asked to believe that while it was as relevant there as it would have been irrelevant in the House of Commons, though it involved the introduction of outsiders—to wit, Mr. Lloyd George and the Master of Elibank, who were not parties to the case—it would have been straining the laws of evidence to complete the story by referring to the additional speculation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Chief Whip, who, I venture to maintain, despite the Attorney-General, had indulged to some extent in what is called a " bear " transaction which is the *ne plus ultra* of gambling on the Stock Exchange.

Mr. Faber, though a banker and a man of business, appeared to be equally puzzled.

Q. Yes, but I mean this—when you said to me " I really was doing the whole transaction," I frankly did not in the least realise that they had another transaction besides that ? *A.* That may be. I quite understand that, because you had not heard of it.

Q. No, I had not ? *A.* But your question was proved [*sic ?*] upon that basis and I answered you.

Q. That is just what I want to get. You limited yourself strictly in that reply to the narrower question which I had put to you ? *A.* I limited myself to the part that I had played in it, which was the question put to me.

As regards the " common venture " between the three Ministers, namely the £10,000, Sir Rufus Isaacs had " paid for the lot " and held the balance at present, and his colleagues owed him a small amount on the transaction, perhaps £80 each. " My desire has been to keep things as they were as far as I possibly could from the moment I heard the rumours. From the moment I heard there were these rumours in July my anxiety has been that matters should be kept exactly as they were and I have never bothered further about them." He had paid his brother Harry a cheque of £8129 as already noted this year

without any interest as "we brothers had never drawn interest from each other and he would not receive it."

Before the close of his evidence Sir Rufus Isaacs was asked, was not the question of the speculation in American shares also raised in the article in the October *National Review*. "*A*. Certainly not. If you say it was I will be much obliged to you if you would show me where, because I have myself examined all that I could find. I have never seen any reference to that—never." He was at once referred to it, upon which the Chairman observed: "I think you should leave the *National Review*, seeing what our experience has been." And later on, when Mr. Lloyd George's attention was directed to this article the Attorney-General who, although he had given his evidence, was an anxious auditor of his colleague's statement, jumped in with a fiery denunciation and cut the matter short. But the reader is in a position to form his own opinion as to whether the American Marconi Company had been discussed in the villainous pages of the *National Review* with sufficient precision to enable Ministers to disclose their American speculations in the October Debate, which destroyed so many illusions and from which some reputations will never recover.

XIV. GAMBLING OR INVESTMENT?

The next witness, Mr. Lloyd George, had a very painful story to tell (March 28), and although hysterical henchmen in the Press professed themselves delighted with the performance of their hero, it was obvious to every onlooker that he did not share their satisfaction. There were signals of distress from a guilty conscience. One would have been almost sorry for him had he not throughout his political career been so vindictive and malignant, while ever since he became Chancellor of the Exchequer he has devoted himself to setting one class against another, ostensibly from love of "the people," but probably in order to divert attention from the Radical plutocracy to which he himself belongs, whose code we are beginning to realise, not that we have got to the bottom of the well where truth lives. As head of a Department his methods are peculiar; he is without knowledge of any inconvenient transaction with which that Department may be associated, though he is prepared at all times to give it a general certificate of character, while saving himself at the expense of officials who can't defend themselves. He always claims the credit of such magnificent achievements as the People's Budget, in which case the bureaucracy sinks into the background.

He briefly reviewed the work of various committees which had interested themselves in wireless telegraphy, mentioning the recommendation of the Imperial Conference of June 1911 in favour of the establishment of a chain of British-owned wireless stations for commercial and strategic purposes. When this subject was put before him by the Postmaster-General as a matter involving a "certain capital expenditure"—though, needless to say, he could not remember the amount, and there appears to be no record in the Treasury on the subject—"but my recollection is that he (Mr. Herbert Samuel) said it would run to some hundreds of thousands of

pounds. My recollection also is that I asked him whether that would mean that I should have to find the money in the course of the current financial year. There again my recollection is that he thought I might have to, and he was putting it to me as a proposition which I might have to face pretty soon to find the money." As counsel was not allowed to cross-examine Ministers, who on their side were free to indulge in any declamation they pleased against previous witnesses, while at a pinch when Mr. Lloyd George was in difficulties the Attorney-General was, so to speak, allowed to "chip in" as *amicus curiæ* with a watching brief for interested parties, I propose to comment more freely on the Chancellor of the Exchequer's evidence, though all comments pale beside his own observations. As to the money required for an Imperial wireless scheme it is only necessary to say that no serious scheme would appeal to the present Government, who have consistently shown a contemptuous disregard for all strategic requirements on land and sea and in the air. Nevertheless, when it was a question of knuckling down to the Marconi Company economy was banished to Saturn and money was poured out *ad lib.* without any serious estimate, so far as can be made out, either by the Treasury or other Departments as to what this costly partnership might ultimately cost the taxpayer. In the third place we must remember that in the year 1911 the Treasury was rich enough to find a quarter of a million per annum, representing a capital sum of six or seven million pounds for the payment of Members of Parliament—expenditure on which the country had never been consulted at any general election.

Then came the appointment of the Committee on Imperial Wireless Telegraphy—in connection with which, by the way, there was some hanky-panky, as the report of a sub-committee which did not precisely coincide with departmental views was suppressed, an episode which, after many days' pressure, the principal permanent official was, if I remember rightly, induced to describe as "an error of judgment." However, Mr. Lloyd George would not be expected to know anything that happened in any other Department seeing that he is an ignoramus concerning his own. The question at this stage (the beginning of 1912) was entirely in the hands of the Postmaster-

General; the Prime Minister and Mr. George being engaged in those historic negotiations with the miners' leaders, and coal-owners on the coal strike, in which they covered themselves with glory. "We had no time, I am afraid, to attend to the ordinary duties of our Department . . . so when the tender (*i.e.* the Marconi Company's tender) came up I was unable to go into the matter, and it was delegated in the ordinary course to the officials of the Treasury with the assistance of the Financial Secretary." There were no votes involved in the Marconi Agreement, at any rate at this stage, so the Chancellor of the Exchequer took no interest in it, but, of course, "I take all responsibility for it. I am prepared to defend it. I am prepared to say that the Treasury did its duty absolutely—that they subjected the Agreement to the most searching criticism, because the efforts of the Treasury undoubtedly ought to be to keep the expenditure down as low as possible; and when the time comes I am, therefore, quite prepared to defend the action which the officials took." It will be all the easier to do so because of the ignorance of the Minister responsible. "I am giving now an account of my own personal part in the matter. Then, I think, on March 7 (1912) the contract was accepted, and there was an announcement in some of the papers—I do not say in all the papers—not merely of the fact of the acceptance, but very detailed terms." The suggestion that there was an announcement in "all the papers" has now been abandoned, but Mr. Lloyd George's evidence would convey the idea that the Government had made some announcement, as they should undoubtedly have done, that they had entered into this important Imperial arrangement with the Marconi Company, giving an outline of the general terms of the tender. But it cannot be repeated too often, and the reader must keep the fact firmly fixed in his mind, without which it will be impossible for him to penetrate the Marconi Mystery, that no announcement whatsoever was made by the Government either in March or in April —a few exiguous details were dragged out in May—but June passed and more than half July before the Government made any serious attempt to place the facts before the public. The contract was only completed in July and was only explained to Parliament on the last day of the Session, August 7. The

only intimation given to the public in March—and it is impossible to lay too much stress upon this fact—was the brief circular issued by the Marconi Company to its own shareholders, which may possibly have been published in some papers and parts in other papers as an item of financial interest.

But this cannot by any abuse of language be represented as such an "announcement" to the public as Mr. Lloyd George relies on to save his bacon over his Marconi speculations in April. The Marconi circular was a one-sided, incomplete, and in some respects misleading account of the transaction, though I make no reflection whatsoever on the Marconi Company, which was doubtless entitled to take advantage of the fact that it was dealing with a pack of fools—to adopt the most charitable theory. Moreover the Marconi Company can never have conceived for a moment that their circular to shareholders would be the sole announcement made to the public. In giving evidence, Mr. Lloyd George, who is a most unbusinesslike man, with a shocking memory, may have believed that there had been some public announcement by the Government on March 7, to quote his own words that "the contract was accepted." But as this was not so surely all speculations in Marconi shares, prior to the publication of the contract on July 19, are brought within the "close season" when Ministers were in a position to know infinitely more than the general public as to the exact state of the negotiations between the Marconi Company and the Government, including the Treasury, which was still negotiating at least two months after Mr. Lloyd George's first flutter in American Marconis.

It is all important in deciding questions of good faith to look at the actual facts and not to be misled by words. Perish the thought that Ministers had any inside official knowledge of the Marconi Agreement at the time that they bought American Marconi shares—is the cry of the Coalition. They might however have attached infinitely greater importance to the Marconi Company's circular because they were in a position to know what was going on. Take myself for instance, as an average member of the public—I never heard of the Marconi circular or of the Agreement of March (supposed to be known to the man in the street), though I try to follow public events fairly closely and until the month of July, when my attention

was first called to the extraordinary reticence of the Post Office, I knew nothing. Therefore in April, had I contemplated speculating in any Marconi shares, which so far as I can judge at this time at any rate rose and fell together—the dates indicating that this gigantic boom in these associated companies was built up on the Agreement of March—I should have been at an immense disadvantage as compared with Mr. Lloyd George and his friends, quite apart from the special tips which they acquired through the close relationship of one of their number with the Managing Director of the parent Marconi Company personally conducting the negotiations for developing the acceptance of the tender of March 7 into the completed contract of July 19. Where everything is lamentable it is unnecessary to emphasise any one thing as particularly lamentable, otherwise special stress would be laid on the fact that the publication of the Marconi Company's circular possessed infinitely more significance to Ministers than to the general public, including the vast majority of Members of Parliament who do not give their days and nights to the study of financial intelligence.

Ab initio one must protest against the suggestion that any Marconi gamble by any Minister was more permissible in April than it would have been at any other time, and the whole pack of cards laboriously reared by the Coalition Press falls to the ground. Mr. Lloyd George, being in a hopelessly false position, continually tried to save himself by making false points as to the manner in which departmental business is conducted. "I have been refreshing my memory, and I cannot find that there was any question which was referred to me at those dates—in fact, I am perfectly certain that no question came before me at all." Nor could he even say whether the announcement of March 7 (in the Marconi Company's circular) stated "the correct terms." At the same time, although totally ignorant of everything that had happened, he would not repudiate responsibility and was prepared to defend the Treasury for doing its duty, "and I am more prepared to say so because it is not in this case a matter of self-praise, because I am just examining what was done by others, and I think they made such a fight as the Treasury ought to make with regard to matters of this kind." Then he relapsed from the official head of the Treasury to the private

individual—the gambler on the Stock Exchange. "I think it just as well to make it perfectly clear, first of all, what my individual share was in the negotiations in case any questions are asked me about it. I then come to April 17. The contract had been announced and fully advertised, and if it had any effect at all on the market—and I am not entering into that—it must have been fully exhuasted by that time." Once more Mr. Lloyd George misses the point, assuming that it is legitimate for the British Chancellor of the Exchequer to indulge in Stock Exchange speculations during his period of office, which many will be found to contest. The associated Marconi Companies form one group, and it was equally improper for a Minister of the Crown to speculate or invest in American Marconis, Spanish Marconis, Canadian Marconis, &c., which not only had the same name, which we are asked to believe was the extent of their connection, but were under the same control, with the same policy and the same aspirations. It is recognised, because the facts are too strong, that the parent Company lives on its children, but, just as a drowning man clings at a straw, Ministers pretend that the children in no way depend on the parent, although, as we now know, what was long withheld from us, the reorganised American Marconi Company was brought into being by the British Marconi Company, its avowed reconstructor being no less a person than Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, the Managing Director of the parent Company. It is impossible therefore to discern the unbridgeable gulf between the British Marconi Company and the American Marconi Company, which would have made it a crime, to say nothing of an imputation on the "personal honour" of British Ministers, to buy shares in the one when they were at the top of their boom on April 17, while it was an act which the strictest purist might commend for them to buy shares in the associated Company, which in its renewed form owed its existence and its boom to the mother Company when they were at ground floor or at any rate first floor prices—Ministers being at the double advantage then over us of the general public in that they were parties to the negotiations of the British Marconi Company and in possession of inside knowledge of the impending developments in the American Marconi Company, of which again the general public

only became aware two days after Ministers bought their shares. If the proof of the pudding is in the eating, whereas these favoured insiders were able to obtain 10,000 shares at £2 apiece, say £20,000, if you or I had instructed our brokers at the same hour of the same day, namely April 17, to buy 10,000 American Marconis at best price, we should only have been able to obtain a possible 1000 shares at $3\frac{1}{4}$, *i.e.* costing £3250. And if our order had been sufficiently large and our credit sufficiently good to get the full 10,000 shares we should have had to pay £32,500 for what Ministers had been able to get for about £20,000 forty-eight hours before. Does not this give us the measure of the advantage they had over the general public, and as they have had to admit so much why haven't they the grace and the courage to admit what is obvious to everybody who considers this transaction? However, they have made their beds and so must they lie on them.

Mr. Lloyd George, the Attorney-General, and the Master of Elibank (the Chief Whip of the Liberal Party—who was living with the Chancellor of the Exchequer at the time at 11 Downing Street) were intimate friends, meeting continually "at meals and, I think, at golf and other transactions of that kind. That is the real reason why the Master of Elibank and I were brought in; it was not as if he were picking a Minister here and a Minister there; it is purely and simply because we happened to live under the same roof, and we three were constantly together." That was why the Attorney-General told them about the American Marconi Company "and asked us whether we would agree to take an interest. He told us the American Company had no interest whatever in the British Company, that it had no interest in any contracts which the British Company made with the British Government, and that its sphere of operation was confined to the working of Marconi patents in the United States of America, and that therefore it was an investment that could not possibly conflict with our duties as Ministers. I remember very distinctly his stating that fact." What strikes one as odd in this conversation is that any British Attorney-General should inform any British Chancellor of the Exchequer that some proposed transaction was not in conflict with the latter's duty. There have been great men at the Exchequer and, leaving aside all

contemporaries, imagine an Attorney-General going to Sir Robert Peel or Mr. Gladstone and saying to him, "I advise you to invest your money in American Marconis, and you may take my word for it that the transaction will not conflict with your duty!" After this effort, of which Mr. Lloyd George missed the point, Welsh sense of humour being limited to an appreciation of the absurdities of other people, he told the Committee that the Attorney-General "had explained very fully the whole of that transaction," and he would be content to confirm his recollection. He went on to say that he had not held "any interest of any sort or kind either before or after April 17 in the contracting Company." Would Mr. Lloyd George have considered it wrong to hold shares either before or after April 17 in the British Marconi Company, considering that, according to his own story, he had practically as little to do with the contract as the Attorney-General himself? "Up to April 17 I had not acquired any interest of any sort or kind in any wireless enterprise in this or in any other country, and I wish this denial to be of the most comprehensive character. I never trafficked or dealt in any shares of the British Macroni Company at any time either before or after April 17, neither directly nor indirectly, neither myself nor through anybody else." Again one is inclined to ask what would be the harm of doing so seeing that *ex hypothesi* the Chancellor of the Exchequer had no more hand in shaping the agreement or the contract or whatever may be the appropriate and selected epithet than the present writer. The witness, who was not above attitudinising, began at this stage to demand a full opportunity of answering any charges which might be made against him, &c. &c. "The investment (*i.e.* the American investment) . . . has to be judged according to what we knew at that time, and not in reference to attacks and criticisms which have been made since, and which have created naturally a different atmosphere." Surely it is the folly of the Post Office and the Government in consenting to conduct confidential negotiations in the midst of a gigantic Stock Exchange gamble and in withholding knowledge from the general public, as also the organisers of the various Marconi booms which partook of the nature of wild-cat finance, which are responsible for the atmosphere to-day as compared with the atmosphere when the

general public were completely in the dark concerning the Marconi Mystery. Mr. Lloyd George, as we know, has a fellow feeling for poachers and "a down" upon gamekeepers, and doubtless he would throw the blame for any disturbance not upon the poacher who had committed the offence, but upon the gamekeeper who had detected it. That is in effect his position to-day. He resents being found out.

Once again he informed the Committee that when he made his investment "the terms of the contract had been announced six weeks before the date in the public Press. It is true a formal contract had not been entered into, but the real terms of the contract had been announced before. The public knew all about it, and its effect must have been fully exhausted." The reader is now in a position to estimate the accuracy of this statement, which, if not designed, is calculated to mislead. One is tired of asking those who have adopted this hopeless attitude: "As according to you the American Company was entirely independent of the British Company and had not the remotest interest in the British contract, why do you continually repeat that six weeks elapsed between the 'announcement' of March and April 17? If your hypothesis as to the independence of the Companies be sound, you would have been equally entitled to take shares in any of the associated Marconi Companies before that 'announcement' just as after." As always throughout this affair men, even Ministers, are impaled on the horns of a dilemma. The witness had the hardened effrontery to add "there had been no challenge in any quarter of its terms; although it had been announced for six weeks there had been no challenge of it up to that time." How could there be seeing that the general public, including the House of Commons and the Press, apart from the financial Press, knew nothing about it, while from March 15 onwards, when the first question was asked in the House of Commons, the Postmaster-General exhausted his resources in keeping us all in the dark. Coming to the fateful April 17: "I (Mr. Lloyd George) had to decide, as every Minister has when he has got an investment in view. I am sorry to say I have not very much to invest, in spite of all these rumours of my prodigious fortune. It is not true. I am comparatively a poor man." And he made up his

mind that, judging by the canons which should guide Ministers of the Crown in seeking investments, that the American Marconi Company "was not merely constitutional and in accordance with precedent, but it was a perfectly proper investment. I had no information as a Cabinet Minister about the position, the dealings, the finance, or the proceedings of the Company in which I invested. The Cabinet knew nothing about it. There was no information which came to us as a Cabinet about the American Marconi Company, absolutely nothing; and as a Cabinet Minister there was nothing that I knew about the American Company. Had I not been a Cabinet Minister, the things which I knew would have come to me in exactly the same way. I will go beyond that, although I do not consider it relevant. I had no information even as to the British Company in which I did not invest which was not known to the public at large at that time."

So one was not straining a point in asking on a previous page what harm there would have been in Mr. Lloyd George making his investment in the British Company rather than in the American Company seeing that he was, although head of the Treasury, as ignorant of the affairs of the British Company—including the impending contract—as the present writer or the present reader. There are immense advantages in the rôle of a detached Chancellor of the Exchequer who is prepared at all times loyally to defend whatever his Department may have done, though he has no personal knowledge and no personal responsibility apart from official responsibility. How hard Mr. Lloyd George rides this horse may be gathered from Mr. Samuel's defence of his own secretiveness in the House of Commons during the Marconi Debate, when he was explaining why he had delayed giving information. "What happened after that (*i.e.* after the acceptance of the Marconi Company's tender on March 7) was that a most elaborate series of communications and conferences went on between the various Departments concerned, particularly the Admiralty, the War Office, the Colonial Office, the *Treasury* [my italics], and the Post Office, and the Solicitors (who?) were employed to work out the details of this contract. Much to my regret it was not until July that the contract was completed, although personally I pressed it forward as much as I could.

The various Departments (*i.e.* including the Treasury) *could not come to terms with themselves or with the Company on the outstanding parts.*" And yet so complete is the divorce between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Treasury that he was as ignorant as to the position and prospects of the British Company in connection with this contract as any outsider. And as he was in the position of an ordinary member of the public as regards these Marconi Companies, and admittedly if his thesis be sound he would be equally entitled to invest in one or the other, "I therefore considered and I still consider, that I had a perfect right to purchase those shares, and that the transaction was a perfectly clean and straightforward one." In other words, there was nothing to conceal. Then why all this concealment and why the present revelations and sensation? For some mysterious reason it was deemed advisable to inform the Prime Minister and the Postmaster-General last summer of this most proper private and irrelevant investment. Why? Again, it was deemed inadvisable to inform the House of Commons during the Marconi Debate of October 11, because it is now alleged there was no time on a Friday afternoon, though there was plenty of time to vituperate those who referred to the rumours connecting Ministers with Marconi speculations. Again, although Mr. Lloyd George has for months past lived with the single object of disclosing this puritanical transaction to the Marconi Committee, he has never made a single written request to be heard, nor has he ever given the Chairman or the Committee generally the reasons why he wished to be heard. Finally, that which it had been deemed desirable to inform the Prime Minister, to withhold from the House of Commons and the Marconi Committee generally, was dragged into an action brought against *Le Matin*, with which the disclosure had absolutely nothing whatsoever to do. In fact, so remote was it from the subject-matter of the action that many people assumed that the writ must have been issued in order that portentous facts long concealed from the country might be broken gradually and from fear of exposure elsewhere.

At any rate, we now have Mr. Lloyd George's account of a unique transaction, and the public are in a position to judge of his fitness to hold his present position. They can hardly resist

interpreting the solidarity of the Cabinet and the Coalition as indications that there are further facts still in the background which would redound as little to the credit of the Cæsar's wives by whom this country was erroneously supposed to be governed. On May 22, in conjunction with the Master of Elibank, the Chancellor of the Exchequer bought more American Marconis as "a good investment." As regards the previous sale of the 1000 on April 20, which, as we have seen, came out somewhat tardily in the course of one of Sir Rufus Isaacs' outbursts and which seems to some of us, despite explanations to the contrary, to have been a "bear" transaction, Mr. Lloyd George explained that he acted on the insistence of his broker, who is certainly to be congratulated on having done his best for an impossible client, but whether the broker was aware of the understanding governing the "pool" in which Ministers participated—if there was a pool—is not clear. In any case this first transaction, namely the sale of a thousand American Marconis on behalf of himself and the Master of Elibank, was very profitable, as they had been bought at £2 as an "investment" on April 17, though no money had passed, and there were no shares in existence, and they were sold three days later for $3\frac{5}{32}$, *i.e.* a profit of approximately £1250. Then, on May 22, came the larger transaction, when Mr. Lloyd George, who makes pathetic appeals to the gallery on the grounds of his poverty or I should not mention the matter, bought again on the joint account of himself and the Chief Whip of the Party 3000 American Marconis at $2\frac{5}{32}$, which cost £6400. His evidence in chief was somewhat hazy over this investment, of which the facts only leaked out gradually, for he told the Committee "those were bought; they were actually bought, the shares were taken up at the first settlement, which I think occurred in June, and they are still there."

The net result of his various transactions in American Marconis was that to-day Mr. Lloyd George held 1643 shares, and the Master of Elibank ditto, while the net result of the transaction to Mr. Lloyd George was a loss of £500, and presumably the same to the Master of Elibank. If Mr. Lloyd George is as vague as regards public finance as he is on private finance he could hardly be described as an ideal Chancellor

of the Exchequer, as it subsequently transpired that so far from having money at hand awaiting investment, taking up the shares and lodging them with his bank and thereafter drawing his dividends, he had not the money to pay for the shares and was accordingly financed by his broker, having to pay up to 7 per cent. interest while the shares remained in the safe custody of his broker, and a substantial sum is still due on them. Needless to say no dividend has been paid, though it was exclusively towards dividends that the "investors" were looking forward. What most people would describe as a reckless gamble, Mr. Lloyd George regards as a prudent investment. It certainly bears a remarkable resemblance to most of his political ventures and his conduct throughout, towards everybody concerned, was precisely what might have been expected from any close study of his record and character. He closed his evidence in chief with the cheap clap-trap which used to impose on Limehouse and Mile End, but there is an old saying "Once bitten twice shy." Though a section of the people of Wales are understood to worship the Artful Dodger of Carnarvon Boroughs more devotedly than ever, in spite of his weakness for "unearned increment," it is incredible that he should continue to fool the British public. From whining about his private affairs he turned to bluster, and threatened to bring up the Kynoch question, as though it bore any analogy whatsoever to the present business. Moreover, Mr. Lloyd George years ago exhausted and damned himself on the Kynoch question, when he was wicked enough to say that Mr. Chamberlain was prolonging the South African War in order that Kynochs might pay a bonus. And this is the man who turns up the whites of his eyes, talks about his "personal honour," and demands that the criminals who have circulated rumours that Ministers have speculated in Marconi shares should come forward and produce the yet more wicked criminals who mentioned these unspeakable offences, which it has now come out in evidence were the common talk of the City from April onwards and—for very good reasons. If any one requires authority for Rumours he has only to read these pages, which have given the whole evidence of the Attorney-General in the *Matin* case and the gist of his evidence before the Select Committee and the relevant parts of Mr. Lloyd George's declamation.

His cross-examination could safely be left alone, as it only served to complete his discomfiture, and no one cares to hit a man who is down, but we are warned from the attitude of the Coalition Press and the solidarity of the Cabinet, who doubtless have much more to conceal, as well as by Mr. Lloyd George's impenitence and bluster, that the fight for clean government has only just begun; that the entire resources of the most impudent and shameless oligarchy which has ever held power in any country will be mobilised for the purpose of preventing the people from appreciating the effect of that part of the truth which it has been impossible any longer to conceal. Therefore it becomes a public duty to drive the facts home so that all who run may read and exhibit Mr. Lloyd George in his true colours, always remembering the probabilities point to the fact that among his colleagues are other "investors" who may have had a fancy for other Marconis, Canadians, Spanish, or even British, who, when cornered, would always plead, like the Chancellor of the Exchequer, "I knew no more of that contract than the unborn babe. Although my Department was engaged in negotiations for which I am officially responsible, I had no personal cognisance of the great Imperial Wireless Telegraphy scheme on which our safety in war depends."

In the course of what has proved to be a remarkably prophetic speech, Mr. George Lansbury, at that time Socialist member for Bow and Bromley, referred to current rumours concerning Ministerial Marconi speculations in the House of Commons on October 11, declaring, "I hope there will be no kind of shrinking on the Committee with regard to this matter." This provoked the furious intervention of our innocent Chancellor of the Exchequer, who at that time was carrying, or rather his broker was carrying for him, a substantial number of American Marconi shares. "I hope, too, there will be no shrinking on the part of those who make the allegations."

MR. LANSBURY: "The irritation expressed on the Treasury Bench this afternoon when people are making speeches is, I think, not a very nice sign at all." It was indeed a very bad sign, and we now know the cause of it. "I am entitled to say what other hon. members have said without interruption, that there have been very grave rumours all over the City, that people have

made money out of this business who ought not to have made money out of it. I am entitled to say that without interruption."

MR. LLOYD GEORGE made a remark which was inaudible.

MR. LANSBURY: "I do not think you are. I never mentioned the right hon. gentleman. Why he should be so eager to rise in his place and speak as he has done I do not know." But we know to-day as likewise the meaning of the following passage in the daily Official Report.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE: The hon. member said something about the Government, and he has talked about "rumours." I want to know what these rumours are. If the hon. gentleman has any charge to make against the Government as a whole or against individual members of it, I think it ought to be stated openly. The reason why the Government wanted a frank discussion before going to Committee was because we wanted to bring here these rumours, these sinister rumours, that have been passed from one foul lip to another behind the backs of the House.

The plaster saint of the Exchequer stated in the course of another interjection on the same occasion, "I came here this afternoon because I had heard what was said outside. I have waited carefully, and not a single member on the other side of the House, or anybody else who has taken part in this Debate, has ever hinted at anything. The only member who has hinted completely dissociated himself from the rumours. The hon. member is the first one who has said so: I demand that his charge shall be formulated." When at last, after many weary months waiting our stainless, spotless Chancellor of the Exchequer found himself before the Marconi Committee and was asked whether it had not occurred to him to mention his American Marconis in this debate, he replied "No . . . I could not get up and take time when two Ministers had already spoken." There was time to try and throw Mr. Lansbury off the scent and to mislead the House of Commons and the public, but apparently there is no time to tell the truth on a Friday afternoon in the mother of Parliaments. Friday is a moral fast day at Westminster, when it is scarcely in order to speak the truth, especially if that truth be inconvenient to his Majesty's Ministers. Mr. Lloyd George was merely indulging in one of those performances for which he has a genius, namely, *suppressio veri et suggestio falsi*, and but for a happy chapter of accidents he would never have been found out. To efforts to identify him

with the Treasury during the Marconi negotiations early last year he had the one simple answer, "Coal strike," and when recalled to important points made in Treasury papers he could only reply "Details." Everything of substantial importance had been settled in March so as to give a moral sanction to the April speculations, and the witness was even reduced to pointing out that when recently the Marconi Company announced its withdrawal from the contract "the shares went up. That is the real effect of it upon the market." The Company had made such a very bad bargain, "and the view of the contract is that it is a very stiff one for the Company. I think the Postmaster-General got the best of the bargain." And he went on repeating: "As a matter of fact the announcement of the withdrawal of the contract sent the shares up. I cannot explain why, but that really was the effect; it sent them up." Mr. Lloyd George is as reckless in his opinions as in his speculations, and he never seems to know where either will carry him, because if the Marconi Agreement was so disastrous to the Marconi Company as we are invited to believe by interested parties, why this much exploited "six weeks" between March 7 and April 17, which were supposed to consecrate the American transaction.

The witness was emphatic on his distinction between "a mere gamble and an investment," as in the latter one would consider the general business of the Company and its dividends from that business. The original 1000 shares, which he got from the Attorney-General, were in his opinion none the less "an investment" because he got rid of them "very quickly at a profit" without any money passing. Lord Robert Cecil asked him: "*Q*. I merely wanted to know whether the money was just lying ready, and you were looking about for an investment? *A*. No, I cannot say that. *Q*. I understand Sir Rufus put this before you as an investment of your money? *A*. Yes, certainly."

After discussing what Sir Rufus had told him as to the position of the American Marconi Company, Lord Robert Cecil asked: "*Q*. You said just now you had never speculated. I wish to be quite clear that you and I understand the word in the (same?) way? *A*. I know it is a word which is capable of (all?) sorts of interpretation—I mean gambled. *Q*. Tell me if we are agreed

about this: I understand an investment to be buying either shares or any other security for the purpose of receiving the dividends? *A*. Yes. *Q*. A permanent investment? *A*. Yes, that was my view of this transaction, certainly. *Q*. I understand a speculation to be buying in order to sell again? *A*. I have never done that—never in my life."

Coming to the second transaction, which was independent of Sir Rufus Isaacs, when 3000 shares were bought by Mr. Lloyd George on account of himself and the Master of Elibank at $2\frac{5}{32}$, the total being £6400, or £3200 for each Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was asked whether that was not "a pretty large investment considering the figures we have been dealing with? *A*. Yes, it was a large investment. *Q*. Somewhere about £3000 or £4000? *A*. It was £3200. Certainly it was a large investment to me, I admit."

These figures will impress the reader all the more when he realises that in one of the declamatory portions of his opening evidence Mr. Lloyd George had pleaded poverty, as apart from a transient salary of £5000 a year he had only £400 a year from investments, though he did not mention whether or not he derives any income from the solicitors' firm of which he was a partner, which acts, it is understood, *inter alia* for the *Daily News* when called to book by those whom it has outrageously libelled. Mr. Lloyd George was asked:

Q. And you took those shares up? *A*. My broker took them up, yes.

Q. And of course you have paid for them in the ordinary course? *A*. I still have got a balance, but I have paid some—there is something still due to him. I am waiting until the Master of Elibank comes back to settle up, because the liability is mine as the order was given through me and the broker deals with me.

Q. Then you did not settle it as between yourself and the Master of Elibank before he went away? *A*. He has been away pretty well since August, I believe.

Q. Has he really? *A*. Yes, he was in Algiers for some weeks, if not months, and New York, and I think he is in Columbia now, so I really have not had a talk with him about the matter.

Q. Have you paid anything? *A*. Yes, I have paid the usual third when there is a balance.

Q. Whatever you have done the Master of Elibank has done; he has held those shares too? *A*. No, the broker has got them.

Coming to the "rumours," Mr. Lloyd George said that after August he was aware of articles in two or three different papers and periodicals.

"Q. It is your impression that none of them referred to the American Company at all, but I think there is one which Mr Amery called attention to which seems to have some reference. Will you look at an article in the October number of the *National Review* by Mr. Lawson? *A*. What date is that? *Q*. On the 1st October or thereabouts in 1912. It is p. 210 to the end of the article. This is a general attack on the finance of the Marconi companies—at least so I read it? *A*. I know, but does it connect any Minister with it?" To which Lord Robert Cecil replied: "Yes, I think it does."

If the reader turns back to p. 447 he will find the passage in question and can form his own opinion about it, and will probably not be surprised to hear that Sir Rufus Isaacs, who appeared to be getting somewhat anxious about Mr. Lloyd George's evidence, although he had no *locus standi* as an ex-witness, began to "chip in," and in the course of the ensuing wrangle Mr. Handel Booth protested against the article being read, while Sir Rufus Isaacs actually made it a grievance, "You did not put it to me." This article, as already pointed out, appeared a few days before the October Debate and called special attention to the American Marconi boom in connection with Ministers—their case to-day being that their names had never been mentioned except in connection with the British Marconi Company, and indeed some of them are now inclined to make it a grievance that the *National Review* and other critics did not record the precise hour of the precise day on which Ministers bought a particular number of shares at a particular price, as likewise the particular day on which the transaction was closed. Mr. Lloyd George's attitude towards the Marconi Committee can scarcely be regarded as satisfactory even by his ardent admirers, for though we are asked to believe that it was the dream of his life to remove the impression he had made in the House of Commons, where there was not time to tell the whole truth on that unfortunate Friday afternoon, the following dialogue reveals the extent of his enthusiasm, while it also revives the very important question of which a good deal more will be heard, namely as to what communications have been made by Ministers and at what dates to selected members of the Select Committee:

Q. Did you make any communication to the Chairman of the Committee that you wished to come before him at an early date? *A.* I understood that the Attorney-General had done it on behalf of the three of us.

Q. But beyond that you made none? *A.* No; I understood he had said I was willing at any time.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I think the Attorney-General's evidence shows that he spoke for all? *A.* He told me that he had already told Sir Albert Spicer that, and I did not think it necessary, and I am not good at writing letters.

LORD ROBERT CECIL: You must not answer this until the Committee have heard the question, because some members of the Committee, I know, think it an improper question: Did you make any communication to any other member or members of the Committee?

MR. FALCONER: *I must repeat my objection to this line of evidence entirely* [my italics].

MR. BOOTH: *And I also* [my italics].

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee has decided in regard to it.

MR. FALCONER: It does not seem to me proper that we should ask that.

LORD ROBERT CECIL: It is for the members of the Committee to judge, of course.

WITNESS: I see no objection, but I understand it is objected to.

XV. MR. LLOYD GEORGE AT BAY

Again we are brought face to face with the question which the "majority" of the Committee refuse to allow witnesses to answer, although witnesses express themselves willing to answer it. The public is entitled to place the worst construction on the evident terror of Messrs. Falconer and Booth concerning Ministerial communications upon Ministerial speculations to Ministerial members of the Committee, as also the date at which such communications were made. The fact of such communications can no longer be disputed.

Why are Messrs. Falconer and Handel Booth, who took a conspicuous part in cross-examining journalists, afraid of this question, unless the answer would demonstrate that they were aware of actual speculations while endeavouring to get rumours withdrawn?

This topic will continually crop up until it is answered. Mr. Asquith should be warned by the fate of Ministers who so greatly aggravated their offence by refusing to make a clean breast of their gamble at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Lloyd George laid superfluous stress on the fact that he had nothing to do with the proceedings against *Le Matin*. "My name was not mentioned at all"—*i.e.* in the libel—but "I consulted a good deal whether the facts could not be brought out, and I actually saw counsel for the Attorney-General with a view to try and get all the facts stated on that occasion." But, according to Mr. Lloyd George, Sir Edward Carson said he "was afraid it could not be done. . . . He certainly had the whole of the facts. *Q.* And Mr. F. E. Smith, too? *A.* Both of them." Of course laymen can only accept the verdict of lawyers on what can or cannot be done upon legal procedure, which is a source of perpetual wonderment to the world at large. Doubtless there were unimpeachable reasons why one perfectly innocent and utterly irrelevant transaction in American Marconis should be dragged into *Le Matin* action while another equally innocent

and irrelevant one was kept out. At this point Lord Robert Cecil referred to a suggestion in the *Daily Herald* "that the *Le Matin* action was 'a put-up job.'" Although Mr. Lloyd George was by way of giving evidence, this was too much for Sir Rufus Isaacs, who fiercely enquired from the side wings, "Ought not that to be put to me?"

"LORD ROBERT CECIL: I think it ought to.

"SIR RUFUS ISAACS: May I answer it?

"LORD ROBERT CECIL: Yes."

It is somewhat surprising that Mr. Falconer, who is unable to believe statements made to him not on oath even by Ministers themselves concerning their own transactions, did not object to Sir Rufus Isaacs obtruding this unsworn testimony, which he did with some heat. "It is absolutely untrue. I never knew of it until the day I was going away." Directly the *Matin* was brought to him (it would be interesting to know by whom) he at once decided to institute proceedings for libel "without consultation with anybody," and Messrs. Lewis and Lewis were set in motion. A little later Sir Rufus Isaacs intervened again: "May I correct one thing? I said I did not consult anybody—that is perfectly right in one way. I did not consult Mr. Lloyd George. What I did was to telephone Mr. Herbert Samuel and tell him." This only whets one's appetite for further and better particulars as to all the circumstances connected with the *Matin* case, which is one of the minor mysteries of the greater Mystery. We are, however, glad to have Sir Rufus Isaacs' statement that it was not a "put-up job" so far as he was concerned. Might it conceivably have been "put up" without his knowledge by some officious supporter who idiotically imagined that he was in some way serving Ministerial interests?

Enough is as good as a feast, and one can have too much of a good thing. After a time Mr. Lloyd George's cross-examination palled, not through any lack of ability on the part of the cross-examiners, but from the very weariness produced by constant repetition of the same explanations of inexplicable facts and by his discourses on the relation between investments and gambles, and on the extreme propriety of the particular investment that he hit upon at a time when he had no money to invest. His own 1500 shares, bought on May 22, had cost £3270,

of which he had paid a third of the balance (£1162) so late as October 21, *i.e.* ten days after the Marconi Debate.

Q. Is the broker standing out of his money as regards the rest? *A.* The broker is a banker as well, certainly.

Q. Is he standing out of his money? *A.* If as a banker (this was addressed to Mr. Faber) you call it standing out of the money.

Q. I am afraid I do? *A.* Then he is, if that is the banking phrase.

Q. Or may I put it in another way: Is he carrying part of the shares for you? *A.* It is no use putting these phrases to me, because I do not know what they mean. I am giving you the transaction, and you can put them in your own phraseology afterwards. I am giving you the actual transaction. What do you mean?

Q. Is he carrying over a part of the shares for you? *A.* What do you mean?

Q. Is he finding the money? *A.* That is not what "carrying over" means.

Q. I thought you said you did not understand it. Perhaps you will tell me what it does mean? *A.* Do you say that is what "carrying over" means?

Q. I only want to get at the facts? *A.* You must not suggest things to me which are not in conformity with the facts, and which are perfectly inconsistent with what I told you are the facts. I told you the broker bought the shares and actually had them in June. You suggest a carrying-over transaction, which I understand is a totally different thing.

Q. At the end of June there was a special settlement in Marconis, and the 1500 shares are then in existence, and they are delivered? *A.* Actually delivered—yes.

Q. Then they are delivered to your broker. Part of the purchase price is the profit on 500 shares; one-third of the balance you have paid your broker, but the remainder you have not paid him? *A.* I have already said it.

Q. When do you propose to settle up that transaction?

MR. BOOTH: Really, I must protest.

MR. GEORGE FABER: I accept it at once.

WITNESS: I would settle it to-morrow if the Master of Elibank were in town, certainly. Half of it is his and half mine.

The Master of Elibank, now Lord Murray, had not yet paid up.

Q. As regards the second transaction (*i.e.* May 22), do you still call that an investment? *A.* What would you call it?

Q. I should be inclined to call it a gamble? *A.* Well, you would be wrong—absolutely wrong. You call it a gamble when I buy shares on May 22 and actually take up the shares—not pay differences and carry them over, as you have been trying to get me to say! I actually take up the shares in June and hold them.

Q. But you have not taken them up? *A.* Certainly, I have taken them up. What do you mean by saying I have not taken them up? Do you suggest that I am not telling the truth?

Q. Not at all? *A.* Why say I have not taken them up?

Q. I am only trying to define what "taking up" means. Your broker has taken them up? *A.* Do you mean when somebody does it on your behalf you are not doing it yourself?

MR. GEORGE FABER: I will not carry it further.

MR. FALCONER: I protest.

The witness ended as he began, on the note of bluster, but not until Mr. Macmaster had given him yet another opportunity of explaining his inexplicable conduct during the October Debate in the House of Commons, which, however, he refused to avail himself of, saying: "I could not have made a complete explanation before the House at that time. It was an afternoon Debate. . . . It was a Friday Debate." There would have been no cross-examination in the House! That is what we have now come to. For six months Mr. Lloyd George has led a miserable existence because he could not get himself cross-examined, though everybody knows that had the Chancellor of the Exchequer written a note to the Chairman of the Marconi Committee at any time during its sittings, informing him that he desired to and indeed insisted on making a statement, everything would have been brushed aside to enable him to do so. The point is so obvious that it is hardly worth making.

Sir Rufus Isaacs was allowed to continually intervene even during the evidence of another witness, while Mr. Herbert Samuel re-appeared, after giving his evidence, because he had made a mistake which he wished to put right. Had any Ministers at any moment desired to do what they ask us to believe they were panting to do, and make their present statements before the Marconi Committee, they could have done it whenever it suited them, for this very simple reason that the Committee is dominated by a Coalition majority and their friends would have seen that their wishes were gratified. All this will require most careful probing, but it has already transpired that the Post Office at the outset gave a wrong direction to the enquiry by putting in a confidential Blue Book and suggesting that the official evidence of Sir Alexander King, the head of the Post Office, should come first, and weeks were wasted innocently by the majority of the Committee, though the responsibilities of all concerned will have in due time to be revealed.

Mr. Lloyd George's closing perorations consisted of an impassioned denunciation of purely imaginary Members of Parliament who are supposed to have incited the present writer to circulate slanders about him. It is unnecessary to inflict it

on the reader—it was obviously intended for the gallery—and Coalition members of the Committee joined in this ridiculous demonstration. It is needless to say that I have never been set on by anybody, least of all by Members of Parliament, to slander Mr. Lloyd George or his colleagues, firstly because they have not been slandered as recent confessions prove, and secondly because one's complaint against Unionist Members of Parliament is that so far from "slandering" or setting anybody else on to slander his Majesty's Ministers they allow themselves to be continuously bamboozled by these manifest mountebanks, whom they are good-naturedly inclined to rate at their own absurd valuation.

As an addendum to the evidence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer came that of his broker (April 9). Mr. Rice is a much-respected member of a well-known firm on the Stock Exchange, who had evidently done his best to save his impulsive client from himself. Directly he heard of the American Marconi investment by telephone from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's secretary, "I (*i.e.* Mr. Rice) told him I was sorry, as I did not consider it a desirable investment." Witness was not "a bear of American Marconis" and would prefer to give his reasons in private, but he was asked to continue, so he repeated: "I came to the general conclusion that it was not a desirable investment," owing to "the past history of the Company, the method of flotation, and the panicky state of the market. The public had lost their heads over the unfortunate *Titanic* disaster, and but for that there would not have been the boom in wireless telegraphy." His objection to the method of flotation was that "the shares were placed privately. There was a considerable market made in the shares, and in my opinion they were altogether at a fictitious price." That was the substance of what he said to the secretary, who "evidently repeated the pith of my statement to the Chancellor, I imagine, because he rang me up, I think, the same afternoon (April 19)." Mr. Rice then told Mr. Lloyd George himself over the telephone "that I did not consider it a desirable investment. He said very little, in fact he was rather short; evidently he did not quite like, and possibly did not appreciate, my volunteering a suggestion of that kind. . . . The conversation was very abrupt. However, I passed

on what I thought he ought to know from me as his personal broker." The next day his firm (Smith, Rice, and Co.) received instructions to sell 1000 American Marconis, which they effected at $3\frac{5}{32}$. On May 22 they were instructed by telephone by Mr. Lloyd George's secretary to buy 3000 American Marconis.

"*Q.* Did you receive that personally? *A.* Yes.

"*Q.* Did you make any observation? *A.* None whatever.

"*Q.* You merely received the order and bought them? *A.* Exactly."

These shares were obtained at $2\frac{5}{32}$.

"*Q.* You did not repeat your advice on that occasion? *A.* No; it was my own personal opinion. The Chancellor had it.

"*Q.* It was for him to judge? *A.* Exactly."

On about June 18 his firm sent a statement to Mr. Lloyd George showing a sum due from him of £3413 4s.

Q. Did you arrange with Mr. Lloyd George's secretary to take up the shares on his behalf? *A.* Yes.

Q. Could you tell us what passed on that occasion so far as you remember? *A* His secretary came in, as far as I remember, with the statement in his hand.

Q. Came into your office? *A.* Came into my office about the settlement. I cannot tell exactly what transpired, but I arranged to pay for the shares in the ordinary course.

Q. Did he say if it would be inconvenient to Mr. Lloyd George to pay? *A.* Something of that sort. . . .

Q. Did you in fact take up the shares on behalf of Mr. Lloyd George? *A.* I did.

Q. That is to say you lent him the money and took up the shares on his behalf? *A.* Yes.

On October 21 an account was sent in with the request for a payment of £1162 19s. 6d., being a third of the value of the 3000 shares purchased in May after giving credit for the proceeds of the thousand shares sold on April 20, and next day they received a cheque for that amount. About that time, *i.e.* towards the end of October, Mr. Rice had an interview with Mr. Lloyd George at Downing Streect, though he could not recall why he went "except that I was his broker and I did not quite like the look of the market."

Q. So you went to advise him to sell? *A.* I went to have a chat with him on the subject to advise him to sell.

Q. Will you tell me as near as you can what passed between you and Mr. Lloyd George on that occasion? *A.* He thanked me for coming up.

Q. What did you say first—what kind of thing? *A.* I cannot recall that.

Q. I do not mean the words, but the substance? *A.* I said, "I see you have still 2000 Marconis; do not you think you had better sell them?" He smiled and said, "No, I bought them for investment and intend to keep them." This was after my original conversation, and he had other sources of information—in fact, better sources than I had.

The reader will remember that this conversation occurred after the Debate at which Mr. Lloyd George was so furious about the rumours of Ministerial speculations in Marconis. It is not surprising that his broker should have thought that a Chancellor of the Exchequer "had other sources of information—in fact, better sources than I had." Mr. Rice reiterated that he regarded American Marconis as undesirable for a "lock-up investment to put away and keep." If the reader will refer to Mr. Lawson's criticism on the American Marconi boom he will find that in one respect it bears a striking resemblance to the opinion of Mr. Rice, who told the Committee: "Personally I do not like these private issues. I had in my mind a previous experience that I think I profited by, namely the Barnato Bank. The business was done then in the same way, and we burnt our fingers pretty severely, or our clients did, and I wanted to spare my friends from a recurrence of that kind of thing, as far as possible."

While Mr. Lloyd George, who one runs the risk of continually forgetting is still British Chancellor of the Exchequer, was clear that he had been paying banker's interest on his unimpeachable investment, his own broker, who had received the interest, appeared to be of a different opinion. In reply to Sir Frederick Banbury—and the accounts he put in corroborated the statement—he stated that he charged 5¼ per cent. on the outstanding amount due until the end of September, 6¾ per cent. until the end of December, and 7 per cent. until March. The highest rate charged by bankers for loans with a margin during that period was 5¼ per cent. according to Sir Frederick Banbury, who added: "There is a good deal of difference between that and 7 per cent.? *A.* We conduct our business in our own way. . . .

"*Q.* You are aware that Mr. Lloyd George said he was paying banker's interest? *A.* I heard him, but he contradicted that afterwards.

"Mr. George Faber: He said bank rate.

"Mr. Booth: No, he said banker's and broker's interest."

This was specifically put to Mr. Rice, and is important as

indicating the haziness of the Guardian of our national finances, who at the moment is at work on another popular Budget.

Q. 1759 (addressed to Mr. Lloyd George): "What sort of interest are you paying to your broker, banker's interest or contango? *A*. Banker's interest." Upon which Mr. Lloyd George's broker observed: "If he said that, well he made a mistake." Ultimately it became doubtful as to what Mr. Lloyd George had meant or said, for whatever else he may be he is not a man of business, and there the matter may be left however little consolation may be derived from it by the unfortunate taxpayer.

The prolonged wrangle lasting several days as to whether Ministers had any advantage over the general public in their American transaction would appear to have been finally set at rest by the interchange of views between Mr. Amery and Mr. H. T. Campbell, the official broker of the Marconi Company, who appeared to be anything but enthusiastic over some aspects of the American gamble, and frankly regarded the subsidiary Marconi Companies as chiefly useful in enriching the parent Company. "Therefore it was the holdings that they (*i.e.* the parent Company) held in their box of the shares of subsidiary Companies that made the public believe that the parent shares were much more valuable because of the increased value of those shares. I think if you look at the quotations of the rise in the price of the English shares they very nearly absolutely synchronise with the rise in the price of all the shares in the subsidiary Companies and that was the main reason that induced people to buy the shares." Mr. Campbell likewise gave, perhaps unconsciously, a valuable hint to the Committee by specifying the dates of other booms in other Marconi Companies, which curiously enough followed the capitulation of the British Post Office to the parent Company at the beginning of last year. The figures are really striking. Canadian Marconis (I am quoting Mr. Campbell) "jumped up in a few days from 22s. on March 8, 1912, and between that and April 2, 1912, to very nearly 40s. They very nearly doubled their price inside about a month, and that, of course, was another inducement to the old shares." Then again, "they (*i.e.* the Marconi Company) had registered and brought out a Spanish Marconi Company. In February

those shares were only 30s.; at the end of March they went up to 42s., and they (the parent Company) held the major portion of the shares in that Company." We are far from the halcyon days when Coalition organs gravely maintained there was no connection between the British Marconi Company and her offspring. Surely, on the evidence of the official broker, any purchaser of shares in a subsidiary Company was directly promoting the interests of the mother Company by causing an appreciation of her shares, and the distinction between those who took part in an American boom, a Spanish boom, a Canadian boom, a British boom, or other booms, all of which appear to have taken place at approximately the same time, were surely participating in one great common venture.

It is plainly the duty, in view of the prolonged concealment of the American transaction, although *ex hypothesi* there was nothing to conceal, that we should have clear and categorical statements on oath from *all* his Majesty's Ministers that none of them participated in any of these other gambles, speculations, or investments, as the case may be.

As to the advantages enjoyed by Ministers on April 17, 1912, over the general public, *i.e.* you or me—the question is, as I have indicated, clinched by Mr. Campbell's answers to Mr. Amery.

Q. If on the 17th (April 1912) I had given you instructions to get me 1000 shares, [American Marconis) at best, for the special settlement? *A.* I should not have dealt for you on that date. I refused to deal until the shares were in existence.

Q. But if I had said: "When the shares come into existence please secure me 1000 at whatever price you can get them—I should have had to pay something over £3000? *A.* You would.

Q. And that would have been the position of anybody else who had come to you? *A.* Exactly the same position.

Q. And if they had gone to most other brokers? *A.* Exactly the same.

Q. It would not have mattered very much to what broker they had gone? *A.* Not the least.

Q. Or who they were? *A.* Not the least.

Q. So if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had come to you and wanted 1000 shares he would have had to be dealt with in exactly the same way? *A.* He would have been dealt with in exactly the same way.

That marks the difference between the open market (the £3 5s. share) at the disposal of outsiders on April 19 and the £2 market available to Ministers and others "in the know" on April 17.

XVI. "WELL, SIR, I HAVE DONE"

After the politicians the financiers, but I propose to leave off with the politicians, although the financiers figuring in this business so far as an amateur can judge make the position of the politicians even worse than it was left by Mr. Lloyd George. Their story will, however, have to be reserved for another occasion. It is only necessary to say here that shares appeared, disappeared and reappeared, finally vanishing as by a magician's wand, and the complicated story of the statesmen was simplicity itself compared to the manœuvres of finance. Questions have been raised which may take years to disentangle, and many lawyers may be richer before they are solved, as in the light of the disclosures further claimants, who may consider that their rights have been somewhat cavalierly dealt with, are likely to make themselves heard. It would be wrong to say anything calculated to prejudice parties who might conceivably find themselves at law.

I am frankly unable to understand the precise character of the various Ministerial transactions in American Marconis and cannot help feeling that Ministers themselves, especially Mr. Lloyd George, may remain in the dark as to what they actually did. The manner in which the accounts remained open suggests a speculation in "options" rather than what is ordinarily understood by an investment. Doubtless the Chancellor of the Exchequer has no conception of the difference between an option to take up shares and a *bona fide* purchase of shares, and would be furious at being asked any question on the subject.

May I point out to the reader anxious to pursue the fascinating financial aspects of the Great Marconi Mystery, which deepens every day, that he could hardly do better than start from the evidence of Mr. H. T. Campbell (of the well-known firm of Billett, Campbell and Grenfell, the official brokers and financial advisers of the Marconi Company) before the Select Committee (April 7). From this it appears that prior to the famous American pilgrimage

of Messrs. Godfrey Isaacs and Co. to New York last year on or about March 9, the suite including the chief jobber of the Company, that somewhat reticent gentleman Mr. Percy Heybourn, who ultimately had the disposal of a prodigious number of shares in the American Marconi Company which were let loose on the public on April 19, 1912—Mr. Campbell, unless I completely misread his story, arranged with Mr. Heybourn who "went out there with my consent" for the future financing of the American Marconi Company. Mr. Campbell's words are worth quoting: "And I gave him (*i.e.* Mr Heybourn) instructions and said that if it was necessary for me to take up any shares I would assist in the matter, but beyond that I knew nothing, and it was only after he came back to this country, after it was all over, that I knew I had to take up some shares."

The inquisitive reader of preceding pages will note that this arrangement between the broker of the Company and the chief jobber must have occurred on or before March 9, 1912, and may conceivably have been made earlier, *i.e.* within the forbidden period. On the return of the pilgrims in April, Mr. Campbell found that his firm had been allotted 10,000 of the new American Marconis, the existence of which had been intelligently anticipated in the early days of March, shall I say "six weeks," before they came into being?

As a little child in such matters one is tempted to enquire whether this was the Syndicate, formal or informal, in which Ministers ultimately secured a lodgment on the first floor. Therefore is it wise to insist on a microscopic scrutiny of the "six weeks"? Syndicates, as we know, are more sinned against than sinning.

The topic is too tempting. Let me return to the prosaic politician. I would like to reproduce Mr. Herbert Samuel's evidence *in extenso* but space forbids. His explanations of his disingenuousness in October and at other times bore striking resemblance to those of his unfortunate colleagues, and his tardy efforts to save them from the consequences of his indefensible secretiveness last year were as futile as they were bound to be. Nor had he any success in seeking to reconcile irreconcilable utterances, while courage was lacking to cry Peccavi. Although the Postmaster-General has never gambled in Marconi shares he is

largely responsible for a gamble which he could have nipped in the bud, while his conduct in trying to rush the Marconi Agreement through the House of Commons last August without further enquiry, even after the Prime Minister had promised a Select Committee, puts him in a disagreeable position, because we now know that he then knew of his colleagues' initial American speculation, which, had he succeeded in bluffing Major Archer-Shee, would have been buried for all time. The public are likewise anxious, eager, and entitled to know to what extent Mr. Samuel has influenced the procedure of the Marconi Committee, and how far he is responsible for the delay in the appearance of Ministers, in violation of their plain duty as public trustees to insist on making a clean breast of their folly and impropriety at the very first meeting of the Select Committee, instead of putting it off in such a manner as to encourage the suspicion that up to the end they hoped against hope that confession and exposure might both be avoided. If the pleasant illusion that Great Britain was governed by a Cabinet of Cæsar's wives has been shattered, no man bears more responsibility for this moral catastrophe than his Majesty's Postmaster-General. He would do well to ponder on the mutability of human affairs since his triumphant peroration in the House of Commons six months ago when he sat down amidst the ringing plaudits of his Party. "Hon. members have made many accusations and many criticisms. Is there any charge left against the Government? There is no response. Well, Sir, I have done."

L. J. Maxse.

APPENDIX

A

The reader will miss the point of the controversy running throughout the preceding pages unless he realises that the only "announcement" of the Agreement of March 7, 1912, between the Marconi Company and the British Post Office, was the following circular issued by the Company to its shareholders.

MARCONI'S WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY, LIMITED.

Watergate House,
York Buildings, Adelphi,
London, W.C., *7th March*, 1912.

DEAR SIR *or* MADAM,

I have pleasure in informing you that we have this day received the acceptance from His Majesty's Postmaster-General of our terms for the construction of all the long-distance wireless stations which will be required within the next few years for the Imperial Wireless Scheme, and which will be erected for the purpose of conducting a commercial telegraph service.

We shall proceed with the construction of the following stations forthwith:

England,
Cyprus or Egypt,
Aden,
Bangalore (India),
South Africa,
Singapore,

and it is anticipated that others will follow in the immediate future.

The stations will be operated by the Company for account of the Government for the first six months, and thereafter by the Government.

The Company will receive a payment of £60,000 for each station, exclusive of site, foundations for machinery and buildings, and the buildings themselves, which, if so required, will be constructed by the Company at cost price for account of the Governments.

The terms further provide that the Company shall receive 10 per cent. of the gross receipts of all the long-distance stations so erected for the term of the Agreement, which is 28 years from the date of the opening to service of the first three stations.

The Government will have power to end the Agreement at the expiration of 18 years, but in that event they would cease to have the right of use of any of the Company's patented processes or machinery.

My Directors desire to inform you that they are fully satisfied with the terms obtained, the importance of which both at home and abroad shareholders will not fail to appreciate, for apart from securing to the Company an additional large and assured annual revenue it should contribute to a material increase in the Company's general and telegraphic business in all parts of the world.

The contract being for a period of years will require to be ratified by Parliament, and the erection of stations at Bangalore and South Africa will of course be subject to the formal approval of the respective Governments of India and South Africa.

By Order of the Board,
HENRY W. ALLEN,
Secretary.

B

RETICENCE OF THE POST OFFICE

The following is the only information vouchsafed to Parliament or the public by the British Post Office during the " six weeks " upon which such stress is now being laid between the so-called " announcement " of March 7, 1912, and April 17, 1912, when Ministers began speculating in American Marconi shares. According to the Official Report, Mr. Herbert Samuel himself, when giving evidence before the Marconi Select Committee (April 2, 1913), gave March 15 (1912) as the date of Major Archer-Shee's question, though the daily Hansard attributes it to March 18. The difference is immaterial.

MAJOR ARCHER-SHEE: "To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state when the House will have an opportunity of discussing the recent agreement with the Marconi Company."

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL: "As soon as the formal contract has been signed it will be laid on the table of the House in accordance with the usual practice; but I cannot at present say how soon this will be."

C

The following is the only additional information vouchsafed to Parliament or the public by the British Post Office between April 17, 1912—*the date of the first Ministerial speculation in American Marconi shares—and May* 22, 1912, *the date of the second speculation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the then Chief Whip of the Party, the Master of Elibank. Our authority is the evidence of Mr. Herbert Samuel before the Marconi Select Committee, April* 2, 1913. *He said :* " *There were no other questions at all* (i.e. *after Major Archer-Shee's question—see preceding page*) *until April* 23—*I invite the Committee's attention to that,*" *when further information was sought.*

MR. WILES: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has any information as to the intention of the Australian Government to participate in the scheme for the establishment of an Imperial chain of wireless telegraphic stations.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I understand that the High Commissioner for Australia has been informed by telegraph that the Commonwealth Government, which with the other Governments concerned was notified of the terms of the Marconi Company's tender for the erection of the stations, prefers to make its own arrangements for the provision of a station capable of becoming an efficient part of the Imperial scheme.

(May 2) MR. HAMILTON BENN: To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to a circular letter, dated March 7, sent by the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company, Limited, to their shareholders, alleging the completion of a contract with the Post Office for the construction by the Company of all long-distance wireless stations which will be required within the next few years for the Imperial wireless scheme; and if so, whether an opportunity will be given to this House to consider the contract before it comes into force?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I am aware that the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company issued a circular on March 7 with regard to the acceptance of their tender for the erection of long-distance wireless telegraph stations. The contract will require to be approved by a resolution of this House, and, as I explained in answering a question by another hon. member on March 15, it will, in accordance with the usual practice, be laid on the table of the House as soon as it has been signed.

(May 8) MR. NORTON GRIFFITHS: To ask the Postmaster-General whether the legal advisers to the Crown have provided a clause in the contract now being considered with the Marconi Company by which the Government shall not be precluded from taking up or controlling any other system of wireless telegraphy that might prove more efficient for long-distance transmission.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The contract with the Marconi Company will meet the contingency referred to by the honourable member.

On the same day, MR. LYNCH: Will the right hon. gentleman take into account that in various foreign countries—America, France, Germany, and Denmark—extensive experiments are now being made with a view to increasing the scope and accuracy of wireless telegraphy, and will he not tie down the Government without having considered the whole scope and possibilities of these inventions?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I appreciate my hon. friend's contention, but if we are to wait until wireless telegraphy is absolutely perfected we shall never be able to complete our Imperial wireless scheme. The Government are not tied down to any one system, and if, later on, any other system is found to be superior it can be substituted for the earlier one.

On May 10 were two unstarred questions by

MAJOR ARCHER-SHEE: "To ask the Postmaster-General what is the minimum speed per minute stipulated for in the contract made with the Marconi Company for the Imperial wireless scheme" and "To ask the Postmaster-General what is the revised estimated cost of each of the six wireless stations to be erected by agreement by the Marconi Company."

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The contract with the Company will be submitted to the House, and its terms will furnish the information required by the honourable member.

On the Post Office vote (May 20—two days before Mr. Lloyd George's second American Marconi speculation), which one might have thought would have afforded the Postmaster-General a welcome opportunity of taking the House into his confidence on the Marconi Agreement, which we are nowadays invited to regard as having been "announced" on March 7, 1912, these casual references are all that I can find in a long official statement.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: After prolonged negotiations with the Marconi Company a preliminary agreement was signed some weeks ago accepting their tender for the erection of stations to be purchased and worked by the Government, and subject, of course, to the approval of Parliament. It is proposed in the first instance six stations shall be erected, the first in England, the second and third on sites which are not yet definitely decided, but which may perhaps be in Egypt and in British East Africa, and at all events in two places on the road to India. (An hon. member: "When?") That is not definitely decided. The fourth station will be in India, and the fifth at Singapore. The Australian Government have decided to erect their own station, which is not part of this contract, for communicating with the others. The sixth station will be erected within the territories of the South Africa Union. Other stations are contemplated in future, but no definite provision is made with regard to them. We think it advisable to proceed cautiously at first to see how far those first stations will fulfil our expectations.

MR. HOLT made some observations which were inaudible.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: No, that also is not decided. The Marconi Company give a guarantee that the stations will be adequate to cover the long distances involved, 2000 miles and more in some cases. They guarantee also a speed of twenty words per minute duplex, that is to say, the stations will be able to send messages in one direction and simultaneously to receive messages from two directions. They also guarantee

a speed of fifty words per minute by automatic apparatus simplex, after allowing for repetitions, and the service is to be continuous day and night. The contract also provides for duplicate engines in case of breakdown. There are many other provisions in the contract with regard to patents and royalties and so forth, but the whole of them will be submitted to the House formally before long, as soon as the details of the contract and specifications have been completed.

SIR F. BANBURY: Can the right hon. gentleman say what the cost will be?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The cost in round figures per station, excluding sites and buildings, will be £60,000. There are also provisions with regard to a royalty of 10 per cent. on the gross receipts during the period that we may have the use of the present and all future Marconi inventions and apparatus.

MAJOR ARCHER-SHEE: Is that for each station?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: Yes. The Indian Government will pay for the station in India. The other stations will be paid for direct by the Imperial Government, and the revenue derived from those stations will accrue, of course, to the Government which owns the station.

MR. AMERY: Will the Imperial Government own the South Africa station?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: No, the South African Government will own their own station. I was thinking of the chain between here and Australia.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: Is there any guarantee as to the time of transmission on the chain?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: No. Of course, wireless telegraphy, like other telegraphy, is practically instantaneous, and the method and rate of transmission must depend on the detailed and actual working of the station by the operators and the way in which the traffic is handled. The contractors will supply the stations, but they will not be really responsible for them; it will be the administration which will be concerned with the working of them. The whole of these matters may perhaps be more usefully discussed, though I do not deprecate discussion to-day, when all the facts are in black and white before the House, as they must be before the approval of the House is obtained for the contract.

D

Further evidence of the Postmaster-General's continued refusal to tell the House of Commons what to-day he declares was "universally known" in March 1912 may be gathered from the appended series of answers to questions from Members of Parliament anxious to ascertain the truth about the Marconi Agreement. The reader should bear in mind that it was not until July or August that the Postmaster-General was aware of any of his colleague's speculations in American Marconis.

(June 10) MR. HASTINGS DUNCAN: To ask the Postmaster-General when the agreement entered into with the Marconi Company for the establishment of high-power stations will be made public?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The details of the arrangements are not all settled, but I hope to be able to lay the agreement before the House shortly.

(June 13) SIR HENRY NORMAN: To ask the Postmaster-General what will be the total capital sum payable to the Marconi Company by the Imperial Government under the agreement for the installation of Imperial wireless telegraphic stations; if any estimate has been formed of the amount of the annual payments under the 10 per cent. royalty upon the gross receipts; for how many years will this royalty be payable; and if the House of Commons will have an opportunity of considering this agreement before it is signed.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The contract will require to be approved by a resolution of the House, and in accordance with the usual practice it will be laid on the table of the House as soon as it has been signed. It would not be convenient at present to furnish the details required by the honourable member.

(June 13) MAJOR ARCHER-SHEE: To ask the Postmaster-General if he can now state when the agreement with the Marconi Company in connection with the Imperial wireless stations will be laid?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I would refer the honourable member to the answer I gave to the honourable member for the West Riding of Yorks (Otley Division) on Monday last. I have nothing to add to that statement at present.

(June 17) MR. AMERY: To ask the Postmaster-General whether the Government has received any assurance that a reliable and continuous wireless service can be secured between different parts of the Empire, especially in the tropics; whether any responsible firm has guaranteed or refused to guarantee such a service; and what are the views of the expert advisers of the Government as to the possibility of securing a reliable and continuous service by night and day.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Marconi Wireless Company have entered into a provisional contract to provide a satisfactory and continuous wireless service between different parts of the Empire, some of which are in the tropics. The expert advisers

of the Government see no reason to doubt the Company's ability to provide such a service.

(June 24) MR. HARRY M'LAREN: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he arrived at any estimate of the cost to the Marconi Company of installing the wireless telegraphy apparatus in the proposed Imperial stations before agreeing to pay them £60,000 per station and what such estimate amounted to; and To ask the Postmaster-General whether he arrived at any estimate of the working cost of our proposed new Imperial wireless telegraphy stations before he agreed to pay the Marconi Company 10 per cent. of the gross as distinguished from the net receipts of such stations and what such estimate amounted to; and for what term of years such agreement will have validity?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I will answer the honourable member's questions together. The cost of erecting and working the wireless stations of the Imperial chain was carefully considered before the provisional contract was made with the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company. The details will be fully explained when the agreement is submitted to the House for approval.

(July 16) SIR HENRY NORMAN: To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state when the agreement with the Marconi Company regarding Imperial wireless stations was signed; and when it will be laid upon the table?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The Marconi Company's tender was accepted on March 7 last. The contract itself has not yet been signed, but I hope that the signatures will be affixed and that I shall be able to lay it on the table of the House in the course of the next few days.

SIR HENRY NORMAN: Arising out of that answer, can my right honourable friend say how it comes about that details could be given in a circular issued by the Marconi Company to its shareholders on March 9 last, and in a speech made by Mr. Marconi at a meeting of his Company last week, when he said some time ago it would be inconvenient to give them in this House?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: The facts of the case are these. The Marconi Company put in a tender for the work required in more or less general terms, stating prices and giving a general specification which was accepted on March 7, and I do not think, as far as I am aware, the speech to which my honourable friend refers went beyond the facts included in the tender; but a much more detailed specification and many more elaborate conditions are to be included in the contract itself and were contemplated by the original tender. It would have been unsuitable for me to have laid before the House an incomplete document; it must be the final document itself which is laid on the table of the House.

SIR HENRY NORMAN: Is my right honourable friend not aware that the particulars for which I asked him regarding the duration of the royalties were on both these occasions made public not in general terms but in precise details, and that it was those details he told me it would be inconvenient to give to the House?

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I could have given certain details certainly, but my honourable friend either asked me in the course of debate, or he put down a question, "What was the period of the royalties, and the number of years?" I could have given him the number of years, but I could not have named the full conditions, and I thought it was inadvisable to give information piecemeal. There was no discourtesy intended to the honourable gentleman.

Sir Henry Dalziel: May I ask whether we may expect them this week, in time for discussion before the House rises, in view of the fact that the arrangement was made in March last?

Mr. Herbert Samuel: Since March there have been many negotiations on points of detail between the Postmaster-General, the War Office, the Treasury, the India Office, and the Colonial Office, which are responsible for the delay that has taken place. I am most anxious the sanction of the House should be given before the House rises for the summer recess, and there must be several days' notice before the discussion comes on, and papers must be laid in good time for members to make themselves acquainted with them. I am pressing the Department concerned as strongly as I can, and I hope there will only be two or three days elapse before the contract is laid.

Sir Henry Norman: May I ask my right honourable friend whether he will see this is not taken as exempted business after eleven o'clock?

Mr. Herbert Samuel: On that I must consult my honourable friend the Patronage Secretary.

E

The following documents consisting of the Marconi Company's tender and the subsequent correspondence with the Post Office were only presented to the House of Commons on the signature of the contract and were in fact the first serious public information given by the Post Office about the "agreement" or "contract" of March 7, the "announcement" of which in March is supposed to afford justification for the Ministerial Marconi speculations of April and May respectively. The reader should carefully compare all these documents with the meagre circular issued by the Marconi Company to its shareholders printed on a previous page of this Appendix.

TENDER FOR LONG-DISTANCE WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATIONS

I. We, the Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Company, hereinafter called the Company, hereby offer to erect Wireless Telegraph Stations capable of communicating over a range of at least two thousand geographical miles in—

1. England,
2. Cyprus,
3. Aden,
4. South Africa,
5. India,

and all such other places as may subsequently be required and agreed upon. We understand that it is desired that the Station at Aden shnould be able to communicate with a station in the Union of South Africa; but should this prove impracticable or undesirable we offer to erect a station at Nairobi either in place of or in addition to the station at Aden as may be desired.

II. The stations shall be erected in accordance with specifications to be prepared by us, and to be approved by the Postmaster-General of the United Kingdom, hereinafter called the Postmaster-General, on behalf of the Government of the United Kingdom, and of the Governments of all the Dominions and Colonies concerned, and in accordance with the annexed Conditions.

III. A formal Agreement, hereinafter called the said Agreement, shall be prepared in draft to embody the above undertakings and the annexed conditions, which Agreement shall provide that all and any other long-distance stations which the Government of the United Kingdom and the Governments of all the Dominions and Colonies

represented herein by the Postmaster-General may require shall be constructed by the Company upon the same terms as those herein specified, together with any further conditions which may be found necessary or desirable, and after the approval of this draft by the Postmaster-General and the Company, the said Agreement shall be prepared in accordance with it and shall be executed by the Postmaster-General and the Company.

Conditions.

1. The Company shall provide complete wireless apparatus for duplex working and fast-speed automatic working, masts, earth connections, and duplicate power plant at each station for the sum of £60,000 per station.

2. The Company shall also, if required, construct buildings, make foundations for masts and machinery, and carry out other necessary works at cost price.

3. The Company shall demonstrate that the stations are capable of continuous communication for commercial purposes both by day and by night over the required distance at a speed of 20 words a minute duplex with ordinary working, or 50 simplex with automatic working, after allowing for repetitions in either case.

4. The Company shall work the stations for a period of six months at cost price to the Postmaster-General and shall remedy without charge any defects which may manifest themselves during that period.

5. If successful working has been established at the end of the period of six months the Company shall hand the stations over to be worked by the Governments concerned.

6. The said Agreement shall extend for a period of 28 years from the date of the completion of the first five stations, determinable at the end of 18 years from the date of such completion by six months' notice by the Postmaster-General, and during its continuance the Postmaster-General shall pay to the Company by way of royalty 10 per cent. of the gross receipts of the stations above mentioned, and of any other stations hereafter erected under the provisions of the said Agreement.

7. The Company and Mr. Marconi will during the continuance of the said Agreement give to the Postmaster-General all their assistance and advice for the successful working of the stations.

8. The Company and Mr. Marconi will during the continuance of the said Agreement give to the Postmaster-General the right to use at the stations erected under the provisions of the said Agreement all inventions, improvements, and patents to which they or he are or may become entitled, and of which they or he are or may become possessed, and over which they or he have control and power to use, and which may be used by them or him and all improvements in such inventions and patents without any payments beyond those specified in the said Agreement.

9. The Postmaster-General shall have the right to introduce into the stations at his absolute discretion any patents or inventions in wireless telegraphy in addition to or in substitution for those of the Company. The Postmaster-General shall, however, seek the advice of the Company before actually introducing such patents and inventions.

10. If at any time during the term of the said Agreement the Postmaster-General shall find it advantageous to use a system entirely independent of the Marconi system, and should no longer use any of the apparatus of the Company in regard to which a

patent is in force for the purpose of working the stations, the payment of royalty to the Company shall cease.

11. If notice is not given to determine the said Agreement before the end of 28 years the Postmaster-General shall have the continued use in all stations then working under the said Agreement, of all or any of the inventions or patents referred to in Condition 8 which may actually be in use at the stations at the termination of the said Agreement, or may have been in use at them, and this without further payment by way of royalty.

12. The Company shall release the Admiralty and the Postmaster-General from the obligation under their agreements with the Company of 24th July 1903 and 29th September 1909 respectively not to impart any information about Marconi apparatus or the mode of working it to other Departments of the Imperial, Dominion, or Colonial Governments, and the Governments and Departments concerned shall not make use of information so obtained in order to enable them to manufacture or cause to be manufactured or use without payment any of the apparatus in regard to which information has been furnished.

Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Company, Limited,
(Signed) GODFREY C. ISAACS,
Managing Director.

13th February 1912.

GENERAL POST OFFICE to TREASURY.

General Post Office, London,
24th February 1912.

SIR,

With reference to the letter of the 24th ultimo from this Office, and to your reply of the 6th instant, No. 1773/12, I am directed by the Postmaster-General to send to you, for the consideration of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, a copy of a tender which he has received from the Marconi Company for the erection of the wireless telegraph stations of the Imperial system.

Their Lordships will remember that the proposals for an Imperial chain of wireless telegraph stations originated with an application by the Marconi Company in March 1910 for licences to establish 18 long-distance stations in different parts of the Empire, so as to provide through communication by wireless telegraphy between this country and Australia, China, South Africa, Canada, and the West Indies. This application was brought before the Cables (Landing Rights) Committee, which at once recognised the strategic and commercial importance of the proposal. The Committee, however, recommended that, in view of the objections to a monopoly in private hands, the stations should be owned by the State. They further recommended that as the establishment of a system covering the whole Empire would involve an expenditure of more than £1,000,000, a beginning should be made with a chain of six stations, connecting the United Kingdom with Western Australia, and that this should be taken in hand at once.

The scheme met with the approval of the Committee of Imperial Defence, who urged that the stations should be put up at the earliest possible date.

The matter was further discussed at the Imperial Conference in June 1911, and, on the motion of Sir Joseph Ward, a resolution was passed in favour of the establishment of a chain of British State-owned wireless stations within the Empire.

It was also decided, in order to expedite a settlement, that the details of the scheme

should be discussed by a Sub-Committee of the Imperial Conference, consisting of representatives of the Dominion Governments and of the Departments of the Imperial Governments concerned. The proposal for which Their Lordships' authority is now sought has in its main outline been discussed and recommended by that Committee and by the Cables (Landing Rights) Committee; and the tender embodies the concessions which have been obtained after prolonged negotiations with the Marconi Company.

It will be observed that, in view of the uncertainty as to the attitude of the Australian Government, the stations at Singapore and in Australia have not been included in the tender. The Secretary of State for the Colonies desires that a station at Singapore should be included in the chain, and, subject to Their Lordships' approval, the Postmaster-General proposes to inform the Company definitely that a station at Singapore is to form part of the chain.

The Postmaster-General cannot recommend the acceptance of the provision in Clause 3 that all other long-distance stations which the Governments concerned may require in the future shall be constructed by the Marconi Company. If the Company should be reluctant to waive the condition he would propose to meet them by including n the Agreement the Australian station (subject to the approval of the Australian Government) and also the Hong-Kong station as soon as it is decided to place one there; but he proposes to inform the Company that he cannot agree to any general extension of its provisions.

He will also attempt to amend Condition 6 so that the term of 28 years shall run from the signature of the Agreement. As the condition now stands, it appears to him that the Company will lack one of the incentives to expedite the completion of the stations, but the question is not of sufficient importance to warrant the Postmaster-General in insisting on the alteration of the clause.

In other respects the tender seems to be satisfactory and the Postmaster-General will be glad to receive Their Lordships' authority to accept it.

It will, of course, be necessary to obtain the approval of the Indian and South African Governments to the terms.

I am, &c.,
A. F. King.

General Post Office to Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Company.

General Post Office, London,
5th March 1912.

Sir,

I am directed to inform you that the Postmaster-General has now received the authority of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury to accept the tender enclosed with your letter (I) of the 13th ultimo for the erection of the wireless telegraph stations of the Imperial chain, subject to the modifications indicated below:

Clause I. It is to be understood that a station may be erected in Egypt instead of Cyprus, at the discretion of the Postmaster-General.

The inclusion of the Indian and South African stations is dependent on the formal approval of the respective Governments; and the inclusion of the South African station is also dependent on a guarantee by the Company that satisfactory communication will be established between that station and Aden.

Clause III. The Postmaster-General cannot agree to bind His Majesty's Government not to employ any other contractor than the Marconi Company for the erection of any stations which may be required in the future in connection with the Imperial chain of stations. He is willing, however, at once and specifically to include the Singapore station in the Agreement, and, if the Australian Government agrees, the station in Australia also.

Condition 3. It is to be understood that the choice of duplex working or simplex automatic working will rest with the Postmaster-General, and that the conditions as to duplex working and automatic working are concurrent and not alternative. It is proposed to make this clear in the relative clause in the Agreement.

Condition 6. The Postmaster-General thinks that the period of 28 years should run from the signature of the Agreement and not from the date of completion of the first five stations, and he will be glad to learn that you agree to the modification of the tender in this respect.

Condition 10. The Lords Commissioners of the Treasury consider that provision should be made for a reduction of the royalty if at any time the Marconi patents are used only to a small extent at the stations. The Postmaster-General suggests for your concurrence the following addition to the clause:

> "And if at any time he should find it advantageous to use the apparatus of the Company in part only he shall be entitled to refer to arbitration the question whether and to what extent the payment of royalty to the Company shall be reduced."

He will be glad to learn that you agree to this alteration.

It will be necessary to make provision that the Postmaster-General's rights under the Agreement and, in particular, under Conditions 7 and 8, shall not be affected if the Company should be absorbed by, or amalgamated with, some other company.

As you are already aware, it will also be a necessary condition that the Agreement will not become binding until it has been approved by resolution of the House of Commons.

On learning that these modifications are agreed to, the Postmaster-General will at once proceed with the preparation of the formal Agreement contemplated by the tender.

I am, &c.,
A. F. KING.

MARCONI'S WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY, LIMITED, to GENERAL POST OFFICE.

Watergate House, York Buildings,
Adelphi, London, W.C.,
7th March 1912.

SIR,

I am in receipt of your communication of the 5th instant, informing me that the Postmaster-General has received the authority of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury to accept the tender enclosed in my letter "I" of the 13th ultimo, for the erection of the wireless telegraph stations of the Imperial chain, subject to certain modifications.

I regret not to have been able to accept these modifications in their entirety, and now confirm the alterations in these modifications, which have resulted from our several subsequent interviews, as follows:

Clause I. It is understood that a station may be erected in Egypt instead of Cyprus at the discretion of the Postmaster-General, and that the inclusion of the Indian and South African stations is dependent upon the formal approval of the respective Governments. The Company, however, does not guarantee that the stations of Aden and in the Union of South Africa shall provide an efficient service without the erection of a third and intermediate station. The Company is of opinion that it will be able to erect stations capable of conducting such an efficient direct service, but it may be necessary to increase the power employed at each of the two stations, in which case it is agreed that the extra cost thereof shall be added to the price of £60,000.

Clause III of the tender to read as follows:

"A formal Agreement, hereinafter called the said 'Agreement,' shall be prepared in draft to embody the above undertakings, and the annexed conditions, which agreement shall provide that all and any other long-distance station which the Government of the United Kingdom and the Governments of all the Dominions and Colonies represented herein by the Postmaster-General may require within five years from the date of the Agreement shall be constructed by the Company upon the same terms as those herein specified together with any further conditions which may be found necessary or desirable, and after the approval of this draft by the Postmaster-General and the Company the said Agreement shall be prepared in accordance with it and shall be executed by the Postmaster-General and the Company."

Condition 3. It is understood that the automatic working must be subject to weather conditions.

Condition 6 shall read:

"The said Agreement shall extend for a period of twenty-eight years from the date of the commencement of the service of the first three stations . . . &c."

Condition 10 to stand as set out in the tender, and the modification as suggested in your letter of the 5th instant is agreed to be cancelled.

The following to be substituted for Condition 12 of the tender:

"All the Government Departments, the Colonial Governments, and the Government of the Dominions which take part in this Agreement shall undertake not to give any information concerning the Company's patents, processes machinery, or any knowledge which they may derive from the stations erected under this tender, or which may be obtained from the Marconi Company, to any Government Department which may not have caused stations to be erected under this tender. It is further agreed that if at the expiration of the five years dating from the date of the agreement any of the Government Departments, the Colonial Governments or the Governments of the Dominions which will have erected stations under this tender, should decide to erect or cause to be erected a station or stations of a different system, the Company shall have the right of inspection of any such station or stations. By this clause to the extent of what is set out therein the Company releases the Admiralty and the Postmaster-General from the obligation under their

agreements with the Company of the 24th July 1903 and the 29th September 1909, respectively, but no Governments or Departments concerned shall make use of information so obtained in order to enable them to manufacture or cause to be manufactured or use without payment any of the apparatus in regard to which information has been furnished."

I have, &c.,

GODFREY C. ISAACS,

Managing Director.

Note.—It is open to the Government of any Dominion to become a party to this Agreement.

GENERAL POST OFFICE to MARCONI'S WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY, LIMITED.

General Post Office, London,
7th March 1912.

SIR,

I am directed by the Postmaster-General to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th instant, and to state that he accepts your tender of the 13th ultimo for the erection of the Imperial chain of wireless stations subject to the modifications set out in your letter above mentioned.

I am, &c.,

A. F. KING.

[Other letters omitted.]

F

MARCONI'S WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY, LIMITED

RETURN TO AN ORDER OF THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, DATED 19 JULY 1912;—*FOR*

COPY "of AGREEMENT between MARCONI'S WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY, LIMITED, COMMENDATORE GUGLIELMO MARCONI, and the POSTMASTER-GENERAL, with regard to the ESTABLISHMENT of a CHAIN OF IMPERIAL WIRELESS STATIONS; together with a COPY of the TREASURY MINUTE thereon."

Treasury Chambers, 19 July 1912. C. F. G. MASTERMAN.

[*Mr. Masterman.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,* 19 *July* 1912.

TREASURY MINUTE, DATED 19TH JULY 1912.

MY Lords have before them an Agreement, of to-day's date, between Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Company, Limited, Commendatore Guglielmo Marconi, and the Postmaster-General (acting on his own behalf and also for the Governments of India and of the Union of South Africa and such other Governments as may hereafter adopt the Agreement) with regard to the establishment of a chain of Imperial Wireless Stations.

As soon as wireless telegraphy had been established as a means of communication through high-power stations for long distances, it became necessary for the various Government Departments concerned to consider what steps should be taken in order that it might be used to the best advantage for the purposes of commerce and defence. The Admiralty and the War Office were both convinced of the necessity for utilising this new invention for strategical purposes in addition to the ordinary cables—indeed they regarded a system of Wireless Telegraphy as vitally essential from their point of view. At the same time the Post Office were occupied in examining it from a commercial stand-point and considering whether private companies should be licensed to set up chains of high-power stations throughout the world and especially in connection with British possessions, or whether such stations should be erected and maintained by the Government.

In March 1910 a letter was received from the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company, Limited, asking for the grant of licences to erect and operate high-power wireless

telegraphy stations at some eighteen places on British soil. It was suggested that the licences should be for twenty years, and that at the end of that period the Governments concerned should have the right of purchase; and that unless and until such purchase was effected the licences should be continued indefinitely. This proposal was considered by His Majesty's Government, who were convinced of the undesirability of such a chain of high-power stations being developed in the hands of a private company. A new monopoly would be created which might in future have to be bought up at a high price, and they were advised that in certain places at least the erection of the private company's stations would render similar Government stations impossible, even if it might seem later on to be desirable, because of the interference of one station with another.

In view also of the fact that wireless telegraphy had only just emerged from the experimental stage and that fresh developments were constantly occurring, they considered it important to avoid giving a privileged position for an indefinite period of time to one company, and to retain full freedom to incorporate in the Imperial system any future inventions that might appear to be of value.

In the spring of 1911 a resolution was received from the New Zealand Government for consideration at the Imperial Conference of an all-British chain of high-power wireless stations to connect together the various parts of the Empire. The proposal was fully discussed at the Imperial Conference (Cd. 5745), and on the motion of Sir Joseph Ward the following Resolution was carried unanimously, viz., "That the great importance of Wireless Telegraphy for social, commercial and defensive purposes renders it desirable that a chain of British State-owned Wireless Stations should be established within the Empire." In the summer of 1911 the Government decided that they should immediately enter into negotations with a view to giving effect to this policy.

After a series of prolonged conferences, in which the representatives of the Dominions, of the Government of India and of the various Departments concerned took part, the scheme embodied in the annexed Agreement was finally settled. While the accepted principle was that the Governments concerned must own and work the stations on their territories, it was recognised as essential to secure the co-operation and assistance of one of the existing wireless telegraphy companies, both on account of their possession of patents and in order to have the benefit of actual experience in transmitting long-distance wireless messages: and in experience of such long-distance working as was required by this scheme the Marconi Company far surpassed any other. In view of the fact that various foreign countries were already commencing to erect long-distance installations and that it was therefore incumbent on the Imperial Government to act with promptitude, it was considered essential that the system should be established at the earliest possible moment.

It was not considered necessary to adopt at the outset such a wide scheme as that proposed in 1910 by the Marconi Company, and it was eventually decided that a chain of stations connecting the United Kingdom with Australia (*viâ* India) and with South Africa should be established in the first instance—the installations to be erected in England, Egypt, the East African Protectorate, South Africa, India, and Singapore.

The Australian Government finally decided not to take part in this Agreement,

but to proceed independently with the erection of a station in connection with the Imperial Wireless chain. It is intended that this station shall be constructed without delay, and that it shall communicate direct with the Imperial station at Singapore.

The main provisions of the Agreement may be summarised as follows:

I.—Construction of Stations

(*a*) The sites will be provided by the Postmaster-General at the stations previously mentioned.

(*b*) The Company will provide the installations (including apparatus, power plant and machinery), in accordance with specifications to be approved by the Postmaster-General—who is to act in this matter, as in others, on behalf of the Governments concerned: should other commercial stations capable of continuous communication over a range of not less than 2000 miles be required to be erected during a period of five years by any Government which is a party to the Agreement the Company will have the exclusive right of providing them. After the expiration of that period they may further be required by the Postmaster-General to provide such installations at any stations in the British Empire which he may specify (clause 3). The price of each installation will be £60,000 (clause 13 (1)).

(*c*) The Postmaster-General may require them in addition to erect the buildings and prepare the foundations for each station (clause 5)—on repayment terms and without profit (clause 13 (2)).

(*d*) In order to secure the satisfactory performance of the work, provision is made for the issue on certain conditions of a "preliminary completion certificate" (clause 6), for a six months' trial working by the Company—on repayment terms and without profit—at such season of the year as may be appointed by the Postmaster-General (clauses 7–9 and 13 (3)), and for a "final completion certificate" (clause 10). In the event of the Company obtaining the latter, the installation passes to the Government and becomes its absolute property (clause 11), but the Company's liability to repair, renew, and remedy defects continues for six months after the expiration of the trial working of six months (clause 8).

II.—Working of the System

Upon the transfer of the installation the Government may work it at its absolute discretion. It may also introduce any patents, &c., in addition to or in substitution for the Marconi patents, but before doing so it is bound to seek (though not to act upon) the advice of the Marconi Company (clause 11).

Furthermore, if, after the expiration of a period of five years, the Government erects a non-Marconi long-distance installation, the Marconi Company have the right, if they have reason to suspect that their patents are being infringed, to inspect the installations in order to ascertain whether there is such infringement, but for no other purpose (clause 18).

The Postmaster-General will have the right to use in the stations during the "royalty" period any future patents of which the Marconi Company has the use (clause 14) and both the Company and Mr. Marconi and also any person whose patents, &c., they acquire are bound to give the Governments information and advice (clause 15).

III.—Duration of Agreement

(a) If the Government adopts a system which makes no use of valid and still unexpired patents owned exclusively by the Marconi Company and ceases to use the Marconi patents it may terminate the "royalty period" at any time (clause 16 (2)).

(b) Subject to this exception, the Agreement and royalty period are only terminable at the expiration of 18 years subject to six months' notice (clause 16 (1)).

(c) If not terminated in either of these two ways the royalty period runs for 28 years (clause 14).

If the Agreement and royalty period are not terminated before the end of the period of 28 years, the Postmaster-General is entitled to the perpetual use without further payment of any Marconi patents which are or have been in use at any of the stations provided under the Agreement (clause 17).

IV.—Miscellaneous

(a) A speed of 20 words a minute under the duplex ordinary system and 50 words a minute under the simplex automatic system is stipulated for (clause 6).

(b) The Governments participating in the Agreement may communicate to each other or to any Department of His Majesty's Government who shall not have adopted this Agreement any information as to patents or other knowledge obtained from long-distance installations, subject to certain conditions (clause 19).

(c) Due provision is made for the adoption of the Agreement by the Governments of the various Dominions and Protectorates (clause 28).

(d) The usual provisions are inserted with regard to the observance of the Fair Wages Resolution (clause 12), the non-participation of members of the House of Commons (clause 23) and the necessity of obtaining the approval of the House of Commons by Resolution (clause 27)—as well as of the Governments of the Union of South Africa and Egypt and the Secretary of State for India so far as they are concerned.

V.—Finance

As already stated, the Government undertakes to provide the site, to pay £60,000 for each installation, and to pay for buildings and for the expenses of trial working on repayment terms (excluding profit to the Company).

During the royalty period it undertakes to pay to the Company a royalty of 10 per cent. of the gross receipts.

It retains full discretion as to rates and no reference is made to the point in the Agreement. The present intention is that the charge to the public should be built up out of terminal and transit rates for the respective stations—each station being credited with its own receipts and debited with its own expenses. Any stations in India and the Union of South Africa will be worked and financed by the respective Governments. Any stations in England, Egypt, the East African Protectorate and Singapore will be worked by the Postmaster-General and financed from the Post Office Vote.

No accurate forecast of revenue and expenditure is possible in the circumstances; but it is intended that the service should be self-supporting and that rates should be fixed accordingly.

My Lords approve of the terms of the Contract.

This Indenture made the 19th day of July 1912 BETWEEN MARCONI'S WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY LIMITED the Registered Office of which is situate at Marconi House Strand in the County of London (hereinafter referred to as the "Company" which expression shall include their successors and permitted assigns) of the first part THE RIGHT HONOURABLE HERBERT LOUIS SAMUEL M.P. His Majesty's Postmaster-General (hereinafter referred to as "the Postmaster-General" which expression shall include his successors in the Office of His Majesty's Postmaster-General) on behalf of His Majesty and also on behalf of the Governments of India and of the Union of South Africa and such other Governments as shall hereafter adopt this Agreement respectively (so far as such Governments are concerned in this Agreement) of the second part and COMMENDATORE GUGLIELMO MARCONI of Marconi House aforesaid Chief Scientific Adviser and Director of the Company of the third part WHEREAS the Postmaster-General proposes to establish or to arrange for the establishment of stations in various parts of the British Empire to be used for the exchange of Government public and other wireless telegrams by long-distance wireless telegraphy AND WHEREAS the Company have agreed to supply certain installations for the purposes aforesaid upon the terms and subject to the covenants agreements and conditions hereinafter appearing AND WHEREAS it has been agreed that the said Commendatore Guglielmo Marconi shall become a party to these presents for the purpose of certain of the said covenents agreements and conditions:

NOW THIS INDENTURE WITNESSETH that in pursuance of the said Agreement and for the considerations hereinafter appearing it is hereby agreed and declared between the parties hereto and the Company (as to the covenants and agreements hereinafter contained on the part of the Company) and the said *Commendator Guglielmo Marconi* (as to the covenants and agreements hereinafter contained on his part) DO hereby respectively COVENANT AND AGREE with the Postmaster-General and the Postmaster-General (as to the covenants and agreements hereinafter contained on his part) in exercise of all powers and authorities enabling him in this behalf DOTH hereby covenant and agree with the Company in manner following (that is to say):

1. *Interpretation clause.* IN this Agreement the following words and expressions shall have the several meanings hereinafter assigned to them unless there be something either in the subject or context repugnant to such construction (that is to say):

The expression "wireless telegraphy" has the same meaning as in the Wireless Telegraphy Act 1904.

The expression "Marconi system" means the apparatus for wireless telegraphy used in the system known as the Marconi system of wireless telegraphy.

The expression "long-distance installation" means a complete installation of the Marconi system capable of continuously and efficiently communicating by day and night in one or more directions over a range of not less than two thousand

geographical miles and intended primarily for commercial use with all necessary apparatus for both duplex working and fast speed automatic working masts earth connections underground wires and cables and duplicate power plant and all other plant materials apparatus machinery appliances and things whatsoever necessary for the satisfactory working thereof or in connection therewith or incidental thereto.

The expression "station" means a place or building established for the purpose of working wireless telegraphy by means of a long-distance installation.

The expression "the inventor" means the said Commendatore Guglielmo Marconi and any other person or persons to whose patents inventions processes or improvements the Company or the said Commendatore Guglielmo Marconi are or may become entitled or of which they or he are or may become possessed or over which they or he have control or power to use or which may be used by them or him.

The expression "Marconi Patents" means all patents and all inventions processes and improvements (whether or not such inventions processes and improvements have been patented or protected) to which the Company or the inventor are or may become entitled or of which they or he are or may become possessed or over which they or he have control and power to use or which may be used by them or him.

The expression "wireless telegram" means a message transmitted or intended to be transmitted between stations wholly or in part by means of wireless telegraphy.

The expression "Government wireless telegram" means a wireless telegram sent upon His Majesty's Service or upon the service or for the purposes of any Department of His Majesty's Government or of any Government on whose behalf the Postmaster-General shall have entered into this Agreement or of any other British Dominion Colony Protectorate or Dependency.

The expression "public wireless telegram" means a wireless telegram (not being a Government wireless telegram) sent by any person under such regulations as to charges or otherwise as may be made from time to time by the Postmaster-General.

The expression "gross receipts" means such portion of the sums received for the transmission of public wireless telegrams by means of long-distance installations as shall be certified by the Comptroller and Accountant-General of the Post Office (whose certificate shall be conclusive for all purposes) as being appropriate to the station or stations herein referred to used for the purpose of such transmission.

2. *Company to construct long-distance installations at specified stations.* The Company shall provide erect construct and establish a long-distance installation for the Postmaster-General at such stations as the Postmaster-General shall specify in the following countries dominions colonies protectorates or places that is to say: (1) England (2) Egypt (3) East African Protectorate (4) The Union of South Africa (5) India (6) Singapore or in the neighbouring part of the Malay Peninsula—so as to provide efficient communication by wireless telegraphy between all or any of the said stations.

3. *Company to construct additional long-distance installations.* The Company shall also provide erect construct and establish a long-distance installation at such other stations in the British Empire or in any British Protectorate as may hereafter be specified by the Postmaster-General Provided always that during a period of five years from the date of this Agreement no long-distance installation shall be provided at any station for the Postmaster-General or for any Government on whose behalf he has entered into this Agreement except by the Company upon the terms of this Agreement nor shall the Postmaster-General or any such Government enter into any contract or agreement during the period aforesaid for the provision of such an installation by any person firm or corporation other than the Company.

4. *Provisions as to construction of long-distance installations by the Company.* (1) The long-distance installations to be provided by the Company in pursuance of this Agreement shall be erected constructed and established at the stations in accordance in all respects with the Specifications to be approved by the Postmaster-General or with such variations from such Specifications as may be approved by the Postmaster-General before the work is commenced and every such long-distance installation shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General in all respects within twelve calendar months from the date on which the Postmaster-General shall have notified to the Company in writing that the site has been acquired and the foundations and buildings completed and requested the Company to provide the installation in pursuance of this Agreement.

(2) All material machinery or plant intended to be used in upon or for the purposes of the erection construction and establishment of any such long-distance installation shall before being used for the purposes aforesaid and (in the case of long-distance installations other than that to be provided at the Station in England) before being sent out of the United Kingdom and also at all times during the progress of the work be submitted when required for inspection and examination by an Officer to be appointed for that purpose by the Postmaster-General and in case such Officer shall certify that any such material machinery or plant is not in accordance with the said Specifications the Company shall substitute therefor such other material machinery or plant as may be necessary to comply with the said Specifications.

5. *Company to construct buildings and carry out other works if required.* The Company shall also if required by the Postmaster-General erect and construct for the Postmaster-General any building for the purpose of any station at which a long-distance installation is to be provided by the Company as aforesaid and make and prepare foundations for masts and machinery and carry out any other works for the purpose of or in connection with such station as shall not be included in the Specifications for the long-distance installation or other the work which the Company are bound to carry out under any other clause of this Agreement The building and other work to be performed by the Company under this Clause shall be in accordance in all respects with the drawings and specifications to be prepared on behalf of the Postmaster-General and completed to his satisfaction with all reasonable speed.

6. *Company to demonstrate satisfactory completion and working of long-distance installations.* Upon the completion in manner aforesaid of any long-distance installation at any station the Company shall at their own expense demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General by actual working during a period of at least seven

days that such long-distance installation has been completed in accordance with the terms of this Agreement in all respects and is capable of continuous and efficient communication and working for commercial purposes both by day and by night with the next station or stations as set out in clause 2 and with such other station or stations (not being more than 2100 geographical miles distant) as shall be specified by the Postmaster-General according to both the following systems namely duplex with ordinary working and simplex with automatic working at a speed as regards the duplex ordinary system of 20 words a minute and as regards the simplex automatic system of 50 words a minute after allowing for whatever repetitions in each case may be necessary to ensure the accuracy of the telegrams When the conditions of this clause have been duly complied with by the Company a certificate to that effect (hereinafter referred to as "the preliminary completion certificate") shall be given on behalf of the Postmaster-General by the Engineer-in-Chief or other duly authorised Officer of the Post Office.

7. *Company to work long-distance installations for six calendar months if required.* The Company shall if required by the Postmaster-General during a period of six calendar months at such season of the year as the Postmaster-General shall appoint in respect of such station after the preliminary completion certificate shall have been given in respect of the long-distance installation at any station (subject nevertheless as hereinafter provided) work the said long-distance installation by their own officers and servants on behalf of the Postmaster-General.

8. *Company to make good defects during such period.* The Company shall at their own expense during the period of six calendar months for which they shall work any long-distance installation in pursuance of the last preceding clause maintain repair and renew such long-distance installation and remedy and make good to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General any defect therein or in the working thereof which shall in the opinion of the Postmaster-General become manifest during such period as aforesaid and shall also during the next succeeding period of six calendar months after the expiration of the first period at their own expense repair renew remedy and make good to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General any defect in any such long-distance installation or any of the plant thereof.

9. *Company to receive and transmit wireless telegrams during such period.* The Company shall during such period of six calendar months as aforesaid receive Government wireless telegrams and public wireless telegrams for transmission and transmit the same by means of the long-distance installations on behalf of the Postmaster-General and the Governments on whose behalf he has entered into this Agreement subject to the following conditions:

(1) Government wireless telegrams shall at all times be transmitted in priority to all other wireless telegrams whatsoever;

(2) Public wireless telegrams shall be transmitted for all persons alike without favour or preference;

(3) The Company shall perform observe and comply with such regulations as to the receipt transmission and delivery of or otherwise in relation to Government wireless telegrams and public wireless telegrams and the charges therefor as may be made by the Postmaster-General;

(4) The Company shall account to the Postmaster-General for all sums received

by the Company in respect of the matters aforesaid and shall keep full accounts records and registers of all Government wireless telegrams and public wireless telegrams transmitted by means of the long-distance installation and the sums received by the Company as aforesaid and shall specify in such accounts records and registers such details as to the origin destination and transmission of such Government wireless telegrams and public wireless telegrams or otherwise as the Postmaster-General may require.

(5) At the expiration of the said period of six calendar months the Company shall pay to the Postmaster-General the whole of the sums received by the Company in respect of the matters aforesaid without any deduction whatsoever.

10. *Final completion certificate.* If at the expiration of the period of six calendar months during which any such long-distance installation shall have been worked by the Company as hereinbefore provided or at any time during such period the Postmaster-General shall be of opinion that the working of such long-distance installation is satisfactory and efficient and that the Company have duly performed their obligations in respect thereof in accordance with the provisions hereinbefore contained a certificate to that effect (hereinafter referred to as "the final completion certificate") shall be given on behalf of the Postmaster-General by the Engineer-in-Chief or other duly authorised officer of the Post Office.

11. *Rights of Postmaster-General after giving of final completion certificate.* Upon the giving of the final completion certificate in respect of the long-distance installation at any station the Company shall hand over such long-distance installation to the Postmaster-General and the same shall become the absolute property of the Postmaster-General or of the Government on whose behalf the station shall have been established as the case may be and he and they shall be entitled to use work and maintain the same in any way and for any purpose at his and their absolute discretion by his and their servants agents and contractors and in particular he and they shall be entitled at his and their absolute discretion to introduce into any such long-distance installation or station as aforesaid any patents or inventions or apparatus for or relating to or connected with wireless telegraphy in addition to and in connection with or in substitution for the Marconi patents or any of them but before so doing the Postmaster-General or the Government on whose behalf such long-distance installation shall have been provided shall seek (but shall not be bound to act on) the advice of the Company.

12. *Fair wages clause.* (1) The Company shall in the execution of this Agreement observe and fulfil the obligations upon contractors specified in the resolution passed by the House of Commons on the 10th March 1909 namely:

"The contractor shall . . . pay rates of wages and observe hours of labour not less favourable than those commonly recognised by employers and trade societies (or in the absence of such recognised wages and hours those which in practice prevail amongst good employers) in the trade in the district where the work is carried out Where there are no such wages and hours recognised or prevailing in the district those recognised or prevailing in the nearest district in which the general industrial circumstances are similar shall be adopted Further the conditions of employment generally accepted in the

district in the trade concerned shall be taken into account in considering how far the fair wages clauses are being observed The Contractor shall be prohibited from transferring or assigning directly or indirectly to any person or persons whatsoever any portion of his contract without the written permission of the Department Sub-letting other than that which may be customary in the trade concerned shall be prohibited The Contractor shall be responsible for the observance of the fair-wages clauses by the sub-contractor."

(2) The Company shall cause a copy of the last preceding sub-clause to be prominently exhibited for the information of their workpeople on all premises where work is being executed under this Agreement.

(3) The provisions contained in sub-clause (1) as to assigning transferring and sub-letting are without prejudice to the provisions contained in clause 22 hereof but shall be read and take effect subject to such last-mentioned provisions.

(4) The Company shall keep proper wages books and time-sheets showing the wages paid and the time worked by the workpeople in their employ in and about the execution of this Agreement and such wages books and time-sheets shall be produced whenever required for the inspection of any officer authorised by the Postmaster-General.

13. *Payments to be made by Postmaster-General for long-distance installations buildings and working of stations.* The Postmaster-General shall out of such aids and supplies as have been or shall be appropriated by Parliament for that purpose or (as the case may be) provided by the Governments on whose behalf he has entered into this Agreement pay or arrange to be paid to the Company in respect of the matters aforesaid the sums hereinafter specified (that is to say):

(1) For each long-distance installation which shall be provided erected constructed and established by the Company under and in accordance with this Agreement the Postmaster-General shall pay or arrange to be paid to the Company the sum of £60,000 such payment to be made in the manner following (that is to say):

(*a*) The sum of £40,000 to be paid within one calendar month after the preliminary completion certificate shall have been given in respect of such long-distance installation.

(*b*) The sum of £20,000 to be paid within one calendar month after the final completion certificate shall have been given in respect thereof.

(*c*) Provided nevertheless that if the final completion certificate in respect of such long-distance installation shall be withheld by the Postmaster-General on the ground that in his opinion the working thereof is not satisfactory and efficient or the Company have not duly performed their obligations in respect thereof or any of them in accordance with the provisions herein contained the Company shall within two calendar months after notice to that effect shall have been given to them by the Postmaster-General repay to the Postmaster-General (without prejudice to any other right power or remedy of the Postmaster-General) the sum of £40,000

paid by him to the Company under sub-clause (a) unless in the meantime the Company shall satisfy the requirements of the Postmaster-General and a final completion certificate shall be given.

(2) In case the Company at the request of the Postmaster-General in pursuance of and in accordance with the terms of clause 5 of this Agreement shall erect or construct any such building or carry out such other works for the Postmaster-General for the purpose of or in connection with a station as is specified in the said clause the Postmaster-General shall pay to the Company the actual cost thereof in labour and materials (including the remuneration of any architects surveyors and engineers whom it shall be necessary for the Company to employ specially for the purposes aforesaid) but without any profit to the Company such payment to be made by instalments to be paid from time to time the final instalment to be paid within one calendar month after such building or other works shall have been completed to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General.

(3) The Postmaster-General shall pay to the Company the actual cost in labour and materials (including the remuneration of any engineers or operators whom it shall be necessary for the Company to employ specially for the purpose) but without profit to the Company of working any long-distance installation and providing power therefor for the said period of six calendar months in pursuance of and in accordance with the terms of clause 7 of this Agreement such payment to be made within one calendar month after the giving of the final completion certificate in respect thereof.

14. *Payment of royalty by Postmaster-General.* During a period of 28 years (hereinafter referred to as "the royalty period") commencing upon the date (as certified by the Comptroller and Accountant-General of the Post Office whose certificate shall be conclusive) upon which public wireless telegrams shall commence to be transmitted between the first three long-distance installations which shall have been erected by the Company in pursuance of this Agreement or until this Agreement or the royalty period shall have been terminated as hereinafter provided the Postmaster-General shall pay to the Company by way of royalty for the use of the Marconi patents ten per cent. of the gross receipts of the stations at which long-distance installations shall have been provided and installed upon the terms of this Agreement and during the royalty period or until it shall have been terminated by notice as aforesaid the Postmaster-General and the Governments on whose behalf he has entered into this Agreement shall be entitled to use and work at or in connection with all or any stations at which long-distance installations shall have been provided and installed upon the terms of this Agreement all or any Marconi patents without any payment to the Company or to the inventor (whether in pursuance of section 29 of the Patents and Designs Act 1907 or otherwise) except the payments by way of royalty hereinbefore mentioned.

15. *Company and inventor to give information assistance and advice during royalty period.* The Company and the inventor shall during the continuance of the royalty period whenever required give to the Postmaster-General and the Governments on whose behalf he has entered into this Agreement and his and their officers and servants all such assistance information and advice respecting the Marconi patents and the

mode of working and using the same and all processes connected therewith as may be necessary for enabling him to use and exercise the same to the best advantage or for the purpose of the successful and efficient working of the long-distance installations provided and established under the terms of this Agreement.

16. *Determination of Agreement and royalty period.* (1) The Postmaster-General may determine this Agreement and the royalty period at the expiration of 18 years from the date of the commencement of the royalty period by giving to the Company not less than six calendar months' previous notice in writing to that effect.

(2) If and whenever during the continuance of the royalty period the Postmaster-General shall have decided to use and work at such stations as aforesaid a system of wireless telegraphy which shall not make use of any valid and still unexpired patents owned exclusively by the Marconi Company and shall have given notice in writing to that effect to the Company then as from the date of the giving of such notice the royalty period shall be terminated.

17. *Rights of Postmaster-General at expiration of royalty period.* If this Agreement or the royalty period shall not have been terminated by notice as provided by the preceding clause hereof the Postmaster-General shall at the expiration of the royalty period be entitled to the continued use and working of the Marconi patents which shall then be or which may at any time during the royalty period have been worked or used at any of the stations provided and installed under the terms of this Agreement without any further payment to the Company or the inventor by way of royalty or any other payment whether in pursuance of section 29 of the Patents and Designs Act 1907 or otherwise howsoever.

18. *Right of Company to inspect installations for which system other than Marconi's is used.* In case the Postmaster-Genera or any Government on whose behalf he has entered into this Agreement shall after the expiration of the period of five years from the date of this Agreement (mentioned in the proviso to clause 3 hereof) erect or cause to be erected at any station a long-distance installation for which a system other than the Marconi system is used the Company shall during the royalty period or until this Agreement or the royalty period shall have been terminated as herein provided be authorised in any and all cases in which they have reason to suspect that their patents are being infringed to inspect the installations in the presence of an Officer of the Postmaster-General and of a representative of the proprietors of the system which is in question for the purpose of ascertaining whether there is any infringement of the Marconi Patents but for no other purpose whatsoever and the Company shall not communicate or make use of any information obtained at any such inspection except for the purpose aforesaid.

19. *Information may be given to other Departments who shall give undertaking not to divulge.* The Postmaster-General and the Governments on whose behalf he shall have entered into this Agreement shall be at liberty to give any information concerning the Marconi patents or any knowledge which may be obtained from long-distance installations provided under this Agreement or from the Company to one another and also to any department of His Majesty's Government who shall not have adopted this Agreement provided that such Department shall have given an undertaking to the Company not to make use of or divulge any information so furnished in order to enable them or others to manufacture or cause to be manufactured or use without payment

(where the Company are entitled to payment) any of the apparatus in regard to which information has been furnished.

20. *No admission of validity of Marconi patents.* Nothing herein contained shall be regarded or taken as an admission by or on the part of the Postmaster-General or any Government on whose behalf he shall have entered into this Agreement that the Marconi patents or any of them are valid.

21. *Indemnity by Company.* The Company shall indemnify and hold harmless the Postmaster-General and any such Government as aforesaid against all claims suits and demands by any person or company whomsoever and whatsoever in respect of any matters arising out of the exercise by the Postmaster-General of any of the powers conferred upon him by this Agreement or otherwise arising out of this Agreement.

22. *Agreement not to be assigned transferred or sublet without consent.* The Company shall not assign transfer or sublet this Agreement or the benefit thereof or any part thereof without the consent in writing of the Postmaster-General and (without prejudice to any other right of the Postmaster-General under this Agreement) no liquidation or reconstruction of the Company and no amalgamation or absorption of it with or in any other company and no assignment or transfer of the Marconi patents shall be made or take place except upon condition that such arrangements are made as shall secure to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General the due performance of this Agreement by the Company or their successors.

23. *Members of House of Commons not to participate in Agreement.* In pursuance of the direction contained in "The House of Commons (Disqualification) Act 1782" no member of the House of Commons shall be admitted to any share or part of this Agreement or to any benefit to arise therefrom contrary to the true intent and meaning of the said Act.

24. *Determination of Agreement in certain events.* In case the Company or the inventor shall make any breach non-performance or non-observance of any of the covenants agreements or provisions on their part or his part herein contained or in case a resolution shall be passed or an order made to wind up the Company (whether or not for the purpose of reconstruction or amalgamation) or a Receiver of its assets shall be appointed then and in any such case the Postmaster-General shall be entitled immediately to determine this Agreement by notice in writing to the Company without prejudice to any accrued right of either party in respect of anything done or omitted to be done under the provisions of this Agreement.

25. *Notices.* Any notice request or consent to be given by the Postmaster-General under this Agreement may be under the hand of one of the Secretaries or Assistant-Secretaries for the time being of the Post Office and may be served on the Company by sending the same in a registered letter addressed to the Company at their registered office for the time being.

26. *Existing rights of Postmaster-General not to be prejudiced.* Nothing herein contained shall prejudice or affect any right or power of the Postmaster-General under the Agreement dated the 20th day of September 1909 and made between the Company and the Marconi International Marine Communication Company of the one part and the Right Honourable Sydney Charles Buxton M.P. then His Majesty's Postmaster-General of the other part or under any other Agreement between the parties hereto or under the Telegraph Acts 1863-1911.

27. *Agreement subject to approval by House of Commons and Colonial Governments.* This Agreement shall not be binding upon the Postmaster-General until it has been approved by a resolution of the House of Commons and (as regards the long-distance installations to be provided at the stations which may be established in the Union of South Africa Egypt and India) by the Governments of the Union and of Egypt and the Secretary of State for India in Council respectively.

28. *Adoption of Agreement by other Colonial Governments.* In case the Government of any of His Majesty's Dominions or Protectorates shall hereafter adopt this Agreement the Postmaster-General shall forthwith give notice thereof to the Company and this Agreement shall thereupon be deemed to have been entered into by the Postmaster-Genera on behalf of such Government (so far as such Government is concerned) Provided always that if and whenever the Postmaster-General shall require the Company to provide erect construct and establish a long-distance installation at a station in any territory other than those mentioned in clause 2 hereof without having given notice to the Company of the adoption of this Agreement by the Government of such territory the Postmaster-General shall be deemed (as regards such long-distance installation) to have entered into this Agreement on behalf of His Majesty and shall make any necessary arrangements with the Government concerned.

29. *Marginal notes.* The notes inserted in the margin [here printed as italic sideheads] of this Agreement are for convenience of reference only and shall not in any way limit extend or affect the interpretation of any of the clauses against which they are respectively placed.

IN WITNESS whereof the Company have caused their Common Seal to be hereunto affixed and the Postmaster-General and the said Commendatore Guglielmo Marconi have hereunto set their respective hands and seals the day and year first above written.

The Common Seal of Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Company Limited was hereunto affixed in the presence of
GODFREY C. ISAACS } *Directors*
H. RIALL SANKEY }
HENRY W. ALLEN *Secretary*
— L.S.

Signed Sealed and Delivered by the Right Honourable Herbert Louis Samuel M.P. His Majesty's Postmaster-General in the presence of
H. E. GALLAHER
Solicitor's Department
General Post Office E.C.
Solicitor
— HERBERT L. SAMUEL — L.S.

Signed Sealed and Delivered by the said Commendatore Guglielmo Marconi in the presence of
H. E. GALLAHER
Solicitor's Department
General Post Office E.C.
Solicitor
— GUGLIELMO MARCONI — L.S.

THE
NATIONAL REVIEW

No. 364. JUNE 1913

EPISODES OF THE MONTH

An Interesting Moment

WE have reached a peculiarly interesting moment in foreign affairs, and one which affords false and treacherous guides yet another opportunity of misleading public opinion, of which they will take the utmost advantage in order to compromise all that we have gained of late years through pursuing a loyal, intelligible, and coherent policy with the general assent of the best men of all politics. The Potsdam Party and the Potsdam Press have been so consistently wrong ever since they began to espouse the cause of Germany through that "pure cussedness" which makes a certain type of Englishman long to lick the boot that is raised to kick him, that it would seem incredible that any *locus standi* should remain to them. Their thesis has been simple and sufficient, namely, to make the "appeasement" of Germany the governing consideration in British conduct, it being argued that, for some reason or another never clearly explained, our existence is a legitimate cause of offence to Germany, presumably because it hampers her Napoleonic aspirations to subjugate Europe, who, to vary an old legend, must either become Junker or anarchist. How this craze has become part of the accepted Radical creed has been adequately explained in these pages. Your Radical has a curious kink in his composition which makes him pro-enemy and anti-friend. When Russia was regarded as a menace to our Indian Empire—largely owing to German intrigue—when

France was challenging our African position—on the initiative of Bismarck and his disciples—the Russians and the French could do no wrong in the eyes of the British Radical, while Germany, who in those remote days was erroneously regarded as a friendly Power, could do no right, and Lord Salisbury was held up to public odium by the Nonconformist conscience for associating with the Triple Alliance rather than with the Dual Alliance. If our Statesmen, we were then told, only had the requisite intelligence to avoid German " entanglements " and to come to a clear and comprehensive settlement of outstanding differences with Paris and St. Petersburg, all would be well. Such was the Gladstonian policy and the Campbell-Bannerman policy, little as our Radicals like being reminded of the fact—and some of us who are the reverse of Radicals have for many years held the view that there was a good deal to be said for this policy because policy must rest upon interest, and whereas we have many common interests with France and Russia, it would be hard to find a single spot in any portion of the habitable or uninhabitable globe where Anglo-German interests coincide.

Campaign of Education

The late Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, who was one of the best-informed and most intelligent men of his time, and though learned was likewise sensible—a rare and refreshing combination—and a few others, by no means confined to one party, began systematically working in the opening year of the present century with the object of putting an end to the deplorable secular feud between Great Britain and France and between Great Britain and Russia. This campaign of education might have failed but for the priceless assistance of Germany, who regarded the Boer War as an appropriate moment to cast off her mask of false friendship and to show herself in her true colours as a rabid Anglophobe Power obsessed with a passionate hatred of everything British and only restrained from translating her hatred into action by what the German Kaiser significantly described at one of the worst moments of the war as " the bitter need " for a big German Navy. Germany was also disappointed by the personal reluctance of the Tsar Nicolas and President Loubet to co-operate in any hostile move against *hostes humani generis*. We can review this pregnant period

without prejudice, and there is an easy answer to those professing to be puzzled by our relative indifference towards the disagreeable things that were said and written in Russia and France as compared with British exasperation at German animosity, which made a profound and abiding impression. We had been on the worst possible terms—largely owing, as we have since learnt, to the malign activities of the political brokers of Berlin—with both members of the Dual Alliance, and consequently we regarded their attitude at the opening of the South African War and their keen desire for our defeat and humiliation as only natural. With Germany, on the other hand, we foolishly imagined that we were on friendly terms, and her indecent gloating over our reverses, and the foul and filthy stream of lies which the German gutter-squirts emptied over everything in this country from our revered Queen downwards, caused much the same sensation as being stabbed in the back by a host or a guest. We admit that it was our fault in misjudging Germany and in idiotically imagining she was a friendly Power, and we bear no malice because the experience was of incalculable value. Unless people make themselves exceptionally offensive to John Bull he remains unaware that anything is happening. Fortunately, the *furor Teutonicus* was too vociferous to be ignored even by the most self-complacent Englishman. Our very snobs were silent—and it takes a great deal to silence the British snob—because Wilhelm II ostentatiously placed himself at the head of the anti-British movement, as he realised that his best chance of squeezing a vast fleet out of his thrifty subjects depended on the volume of Anglophobia that could be generated. The greatest gain of the Imperial propaganda to Great Britain was that it gave pause to well-meaning politicians ignorant of European history and present conditions who had fondly imagined, on some extravagant "blood-and-water" theory, that our proper place was in the German camp.

The New Policy

It likewise afforded a precious opportunity for the general reconsideration of British foreign policy on saner lines. Obsolete prejudices went the way of futile prepossessions, and with a new reign came the inauguration of a new policy. A serious prospect was at last opened up for the British Cinderella to secure her rightful position and

influence in Europe provided she was prepared to undertake her responsibilities. Our readers are familiar with the sequel. The Germans were allowed to rage furiously together, while Lord Lansdowne and M. Delcassé carefully examined and composed the differences dividing Great Britain and France. Germany was stupefied at the result, being convinced that she owed her position in Europe to the permanent estrangement of these two Powers, the continuance of which was accordingly regarded as of vital German interest. The policy of the Entente was almost wrecked during the Russo-Japanese War, in which Germany is now known to have played the congenial part of *agent provocateur*, as it necessarily placed France, the ally of Russia, and Great Britain, the ally of Japan, in opposite camps; and the North Sea episode, when Russian warships inadvertently fired on British trawlers, excited as much glee in Berlin and Potsdam as it caused apprehension and alarm in Paris. Happily, thanks to the good offices of France and the common sense and moderation of Russia and Great Britain, the affair was peacefully settled, and when the painful memories of the Far Eastern war were dying down, the Governments of London and St. Petersburg had the satisfaction of concluding the Anglo-Russian Agreement, which, though, like every human arrangement, it lacked perfection, opened a new chapter in Anglo-Russian relations, for which Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and Sir Edward Grey deserve full credit, even though an Anglo-Russian understanding may not commend itself to a short-sighted Simla school who are about twenty years behind the times through their want of intimacy with European affairs, or to enthusiastic Turkophils who deem that the whole duty of a British Foreign Minister consists in "backing the wrong horse." Travelling deserves encouragement, especially among politicians, but travelling should not be limited to Turkey as it tends to a loss of political perspective. The general result of the Anglo-French Agreement of 1904, and the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907, has been the evolution of an informal Triple Entente which has saved the peace of Europe over and over again in recent years because the various crises provoked by the aggressiveness of a Predatory Power on the prowl demonstrated that, should the worst come to the worst, Peace had not less formidable champions than war.

An Effective Concert

We have heard much this winter of the beneficent labours of the European Concert, to which is attributed the remarkable and reassuring fact that, although the small Powers of the Near East could not be prevented from going to war, the Great Powers have so far remained at peace. Armageddon was thought to be at hand more than once during the winter, and there were moments when it seemed as though a miracle alone could save Europe from herself. Without in any way detracting from the laurels of diplomacy or belittling any pacific factors that may have been enlisted in the good cause, we have seen the European Concert too frequently engaged upon its irritating and impotent labours to place excessive confidence in it alone. If it has held together during the present crisis—and let us hope that it may endure to the end—it was because it differed *in toto* from any European Concert in living memory. Without withholding one jot or tittle of praise which may be justly due to the British Foreign Minister for conspicuous services rendered to Europe, and while recognising the striking contrast between the present Concert and its costive predecessors, we must remember the different atmosphere in which Sir Edward Grey and his colleagues have laboured. Had there been no Triple Entente it is not too much to say that the present Concert must have failed as hopelessly as ever, because in that event the Triple Alliance would have had everything their own way, the remaining Powers being *ex hypothesi* at sixes and sevens. This would have given Austria-Hungary the ascendancy in Near Eastern affairs unless she had from use and wont yielded to German pretensions, and in any case Germany would have had no reason for putting water into the Austrian wine, as she is generally believed to have done. The restraining influences on the Viennese war party must have been immensely weakened, and it is hardly credible that the Emperor Francis Joseph and his Foreign Minister could have retained control of the situation. With the more aggressive German elements dominating the Concert, Italy would have had no option but to say ditto to their projects. The interests of France and her Russian ally are not always identical in the Near East, while the rôle performed by Great Britain as a purely detached Power would not only have endangered her own interests but likewise those of her associates

in the Triple Entente. Not even a miracle could have saved the peace of Europe. But when two powerful and solid groups, confident in the loyalty and strength of their friends, meet in council, the voice of reason and moderation have a much better chance of being listened to than in the absence of that balance of power which is *anathema maranatha* to our latter-day Radicals, but which is nevertheless as important to-day as it always has been in the preservation of the peace of Europe.

Recent Lessons

WE have learnt, or at any rate we have had the opportunity of learning, many lessons in foreign policy during the last few years. We had the experience of "perilous isolation" when Perfidious Albion was regarded with profound distrust from one end of Europe to the other. We had the dangerous experience of carrying the German ticket in the European fold, which never involved any serious support from Germany or the Triple Alliance. It simply meant our acting as lightning conductor to Germany whenever her relations with the Dual Alliance became critical. We became the objective of Russia and France. The Potsdam Party in this country has, as we have seen, only one idea in foreign policy, namely, that Great Britain should play the doormat to Germany, and occasionally prominent English politicians who wish to pass for statesmen, like Lord Haldane, emerge into the limelight in order to do the dirty work of the Potsdam Party, though Sir Edward Grey has not hitherto allowed these boot-licking experiments to go very far. We have had the disarmament propaganda alleged to be largely financed by cosmopolitan millionaires who seem to live here for the benefit of the Fatherland. It takes the form of denouncing every exiguous addition to the British Navy and minimising the colossal development of the German Navy, whose purpose is avowedly aggressive for the simple reason that Germany is not threatened by sea. This same school, which we are entitled to regard with profound suspicion on account of its origin, its intrigues and its aspirations, is equally assiduous in explaining away when it cannot actually conceal the huge additions made to the German Army, while it violently denounces the heroic efforts of France to maintain her military equality with Germany by imposing an additional year's service on the nation in arms.

The Potsdam Party expends no less energy in abusing Russia. At one time we are told that Russia is so rotten and the Russian Army so incompetent that it would be mere midsummer madness in a nation so zealous for efficiency as ourselves to rely on a broken reed when the great day dawns. The next moment we are told by the same people that "rotten" Russia has become so formidable that it is no less madness to allow our foreign policy to be inspired by "anti-German prejudice," as the single hope of keeping Europe and Asia out of the maw of the Cossack lies in the effective co-operation of the British Navy and the German army.

Our Plain Duty

ALL this means that the Potsdam policy has temporarily miscarried owing to the German genius for misjudging a situation, but that should not deflect our policy by a hair's breadth. We are not inspired by "anti-German prejudice" but exclusively by a regard for British interests, which march with those of Russia and France. Germany has tried every form of coercion to smash the Triple Entente, which came into existence to balance the Triple Alliance when the predominant member of that gigantic combination began giving evidence that "Defiance, not Defence," was its watchword. The Wilhelmstrasse has bullied Russia, France, and Great Britain in turn—without much success. The frontal attack having failed, intrigue has been enlisted with the assistance of the various local Potsdam parties usually inspired and financed by cosmopolitan Jews. German diplomacy has lacked coherence, but we are not out of the wood, because, unlike us, Germany does not rely on paper diplomacy for her national triumphs but on steady, solid, sleepless preparation on land, sea, and, latterly, air. Such a Power can afford to make many bad mistakes without suffering permanent detriment. While we have gaily abandoned the two-Power naval standard, which only the other day was universally recognised as the palladium of British liberty, and to-day accept the empty bluster of a Churchill as a substitute for sea-power; while we allow a self-sufficient Chancery barrister, followed by a Hampshire carbineer with a swollen head, to play the fool with our diminutive land forces on the pretext of "clear thinking," Germany has pursued the even tenor of her way,

growing stronger and stronger year by year. Ships have replaced speeches on the other side of the North Sea. Efficiency reigns supreme throughout both services and Army corps is piled on Army corps. Let us not lay the flattering unction to our soul that Germany has received a serious set-back from recent developments in the Near East, because all such prophecies would be premature. She is quite willing to encourage that notion among British simpletons if thereby she can compromise our relations with France and Russia, thus undermining the Entente to which Europe owes the peace of the past five years, which has been repeatedly threatened but always and only from one quarter. If at the moment Germany is doing the civil to us, it is simply and solely with the object of arousing suspicions elsewhere, and so far from tempting us to resume our former impossible rôle of Perfidious Albion, it should have the precisely opposite effect of riveting us with hoops of steel to the Triple Entente.

Tribute to Entente

THERE could be no greater tribute—superficial as we admit it to be—to the sagacity of our adherence to the Triple Entente than Germany's change of tone, for which we should be grateful to Russia and France, as but for their cordial co-operation we should remain the great German bugbear. We may rest assured that we should resume that position the second Potsdam detected any weakening in Anglo-French and Anglo-Russian ties. So long as we are in effective partnership with the Triple Entente Germany may be constrained to abate or postpone her Anglophobe programme. Directly we responded to her false overtures we should return to the period of the "Venezuela mess" in 1902 and the "Baghdad bunker" in 1903. This is so obvious that it should be plain to politicians, who could hardly be better employed than in reading Lord Percy's article on one of their favourite fetishes. It is fortunate that the visit of the King and Queen to Germany for the wedding of the only daughter of the reigning house—a delightful family event—should coincide with that of the Emperor of Russia for the same function, as it is thus impossible for intriguers to give a political complexion to the episode, and we can unreservedly appreciate the courtesy of the German Emperor in liberating those gallant officers Captain Trench and Lieutenant

Brandon, R.N.—also Mr. Bertrand Stewart—who had long been imprisoned in Germany for alleged acts of espionage.

No Call for Crowing

WHEN we went to press last month the unending crisis in the Near East was in a peculiarly terrible tangle owing to the inopportune capture of Skutari by Montenegro, as the Great Powers had decided that the "heart's desire" of King Nicholas's people should be incorporated in the new autonomous Albania, the one constructive achievement contributed by the Concert to the Balkan chaos. The war party in Vienna, which is conscious of having but little to show for heavy expenditure, became elated, while general depression prevailed elsewhere, as the machinery for expelling the Montenegrins was not visible to any naked eye and most of the Powers were reluctant to accord a mandate to Austrian enthusiasts. After an anxious delay salvation came from an unexpected quarter, the King of Montenegro, despite family and national opposition, avowing his readiness to place himself in the hands of the Powers and submit to their decision about Skutari. We doubtless owe this escape from yet another peril to Russia, whose relations with Western Europe and intimacy with the Balkan States have enabled her to be strong and moderate. Fighting between the avowed belligerents is now at an end and peace *pourparlers* have begun, but there are endless thorny questions to be settled which have become infinitely more difficult owing to the acute hatreds that have now broken out between the Balkan allies. Incredible as it seems there has been serious fighting between the Servians and Bulgarians, while the Greek war party, completely carried away by their unexpected triumph over Turkey, appear to be spoiling for a fight with Bulgaria. The gravity of the outlook may be gathered from a well-informed article published elsewhere. Bulgaria has borne the brunt of the struggle with Turkey, as is shown by the tremendous losses she has sustained, and her recent comrades-in-arms, who, speaking comparatively, have enjoyed military picnics, are tempted to try and take advantage of their great ally. It may be hoped that restraining counsels will prevail, and there are wise men in Greece after as well as before Agamemnon, but in any event it will be extremely difficult to arrange a satisfactory and durable peace,

and the journalistic champions of the Concert would be well advised to reserve their crowing.

Petticoat Government

As our readers are aware, we have never been able to regard the menace of petticoat government very seriously for the simple reason that we have too much confidence in the good sense of both sexes to impute to them the folly of tolerating the establishment of anything so disastrous to the country. Its prospects, which were never very bright, are now steadily receding, and little is left to the movement for the time being except the outrages of the so-called "militants"—not the most creditable of the products of a cheap sensational Press, which incurs grave responsibility in advertising hysteria. That most unrepresentative body—the House of Commons—which is usually several years behind the times, has at last been compelled to take note of the general antagonism to Woman Suffrage. The Dickinson Bill proposing a modest addition of six million women to the present electorate was rejected on second reading on May 6 by the adequate majority of 268 to 221—a much larger figure than had been anticipated in a house with a poor record on this question. We need not weary our readers by epitomising the debate, as people wisely refuse to read any more speeches on this subject, knowing that everything that can be said has been said over and over again. Common sense for once found a spokesman in Mr. Asquith, while sentimental twaddle was championed by Sir Edward Grey in one of those utterances which make one tremble for our Foreign Policy. The Division was unusually interesting and hopeful not merely on account of the rout of the Suffragists and Suffragettes by a substantial non-Party majority, but likewise because an analysis shows that this heresy is rapidly dying out among Unionists. The figures were:

	Ayes	Noes
Liberals	146	74
Labour	34	0
Nationalists (N. and Ind. N.)	13	54
Unionists	28	141
	221	269

According to the *Nation* twenty-nine Radicals were absent

unpaired, while a majority of Cabinet Ministers voting were hostile to the Bill, though a majority of minor Ministers supported it. The immense improvement in the Unionist Party—what indeed may be called its return to sanity—is shown by the striking fact that only twenty-eight Unionists voted Aye, while no less than 141 voted No, *i.e.* an anti-Suffragist majority of nearly five to one. This is eminently satisfactory. Moreover, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Balfour, and Mr. Alfred Lyttelton, our leading Front Bench Suffragists, abstained, presumably because they cannot go beyond a Conciliation Bill so-called, and the Conciliation Bill is as dead as Queen Anne, if it was ever alive.

Declining Heresy

In the face of these figures it cannot be pretended that the Unionist Party is either a Suffragette or a Suffragist Party, and it would not be honest even for the handful of Unionist advocates of Petticoat Government to encourage the electorate in the delusion that any Unionist Government would be in a position to give "Votes for Women," from which this corollary follows that no elector to whom this is the supreme issue should dream of supporting a Unionist candidate whether he is for or against votes for women. On the other hand, as the Radical Party voted in favour of the Dickinson Bill by a majority of two to one, while their allies the Labour Party supported it by thirty-four to nil, all electors who regard Woman Suffrage as a sovereign calamity should, regardless of every other question, vote Unionist. It is true that so far Mr. Asquith has triumphed over his Suffragists, but we must not forget that he has announced that in the event of a majority of the House of Commons deciding in favour of what he has publicly pronounced to be bad for women and bad for the State, he would be prepared to change his coat and officially espouse the cause. Then, again, Sir Edward Grey, who is clearly marked out for the Radical Premiership, in which there should be a vacancy at no distant date, is an enthusiastic Suffragist, though he has not so far appointed any lady Ambassadors. So in order to make sure of securing the country against the contemplated calamity of Petticoat Government electors must vote Unionist, as safety alone lies that way, rather than Radical. We recognise of course that it will be necessary

for the Unionist Party to earn the ever-growing anti-Suffragist vote by issuing a clear and authoritative declaration against Woman Suffrage before the General Election. It is imperative that in the event of our Party returning to power we should not find ourselves in the pitiable plight of the present Government owing to the absurd expectations held out by some of its members.

Duty of Unionists

PRACTICALLY the entire rank and file of the Unionist party in the House of Commons, and even more emphatically in the constituencies, are hostile to Petticoat Government, and effect should be given to their views rather than to the amiable accident that certain eminent Front Benchers incautiously promised ardent female canvassers, in the dark ages, that they would vote for Votes for Women. It is not the lack of votes that women are suffering from in the United Kingdom to-day, but in some sections of Society there is avowedly a decided and deplorable lack of voters, a void which no mere multiplication of votes would fill. If we seem persistent on this question it is because the evils of wobbling and scuttling have been brought home to us as to many other extra parliamentary Unionists by observing the events of the last few years. We would not say a word to weaken the hands of a feeble Executive in dealing with the present epidemic of crime, which is the inevitable upshot of the thoughtless attitude towards Woman Suffrage of prominent politicians in the past, many of whom, together with their sheep-like followers, imagined that they could give an academic vote for impossible proposals without incurring any serious responsibility or running any risk. Many newspapers have equally incurred grave responsibility by the flagrant manner in which they have advertised the Suffragette section of the Suffragist Party, while the Suffragists are themselves to blame for their moral encouragement of their more hysterical sisters so long as they thought that "militancy" paid. But now that it is too late in the day politicians are tumbling over one another in repudiating the militants, while the militants after their wont are quarrelling among themselves. The movement may not peter out without some sensational catastrophe. From all these deplorable excesses we should have been spared

had the Press exercised sufficient self-restraint to refrain from giving publicity to the outragemongers, and though these no doubt have been of some use in reminding the thoughtless sections of the community of the motive power of the feminist movement, the reputation of English women has paid dearly for disorders which have been too long tolerated.

Scuttle No. 1

THEN again outsiders can see what is apparently invisible to many insiders living at the centre of things, that political parties suffer most from not knowing their own minds or upon whom their principles sit so lightly that they can be discarded on the smallest provocation. By this time the House of Lords can hardly fail to be conscious of the irreparable injury inflicted on a great historic institution by its fatal scuttle over the Parliament Bill two years ago. We have no desire to rake up a disagreeable controversy and would willingly let bygones be bygones if they were bygones, but unfortunately the effect of the capitulation of the citadel of the Constitution is felt hourly and daily by every intelligent student of public affairs. To-day we are the only great country in the world destitute of the safeguard of a serious Second Chamber, as all that is left to the House of Lords is a miserable remnant of power to postpone the operation of the arbitrary decrees of the House of Commons for two years at the outside. And as advantage was taken of the scuttle of the Upper House the year before last to give £400 a year to every member of the Lower House, there is an inducement stronger than beeswax to the Coalition majority to sit tight regardless of public opinion as expressed in indignant constituencies, so that by the mere flux of time odious and unpopular measures on which the electors have never been afforded an opportunity of expressing their views, and which would not have a chance of securing a majority could the people be polled, are automatically to find their way on the Statute Book while the Peers remain impotent spectators. To save themselves they sacrificed the Constitution, but their own salvation is only temporary, because it is officially announced that among the measures now on the Ministerial stocks is a Bill to reduce the House of Lords to about a quarter of its present size and to sweep away the hereditary element.

WHAT, we should like to know, was gained by the triumph of the White-flaggers on that fatal night in August 1911? What, again, was gained by our Party in the other House by their recent scuttle over the food duties, ostensibly in order to lighten the ship but with the inevitable result of adding immensely to our difficulties in the future when the Unionists may find themselves in power as an Imperial Party who have jettisoned for electioneering exigencies the most practical and effective part of the policy of Imperial reciprocity which constitutes with Defence one of the two pillars of the great Imperial structure which is the greatest task ahead of British statesmanship during the next few years? Evil is wrought by want of thought as well as by want of heart. Scuttles are due quite as much to stupidity as to cowardice. As we have said, party opinion, like national opinion, has hardened as regards Woman Suffrage. There must be no room for misunderstanding in the mind of the electorate as to the attitude of our Party as a Party on this question, nor any subsequent risk of that attitude being weakened through the fluidity of parliamentary opinion. Unionists must convince the country that they have executed their last scuttle, and that they are a Party of pugnacity who are prepared to take off their coats and fight as hard as the Radicals for the things in which they believe, remembering always that permanent political victories cannot be gained by hard fighting only, because they equally require hard work and clear thinking, particularly at the present time; for whenever we see the last of Messrs. Asquith and Co., there will be a legacy of problems left in every field of politics unprecedented in number and complexity. Our leaders are not particularly active on the platform at the present time, and no one reads speeches made in the House of Commons, so that they should be able to make plenty of time to sit down and work out the various policies to be pursued in the not inconceivable event of their finding themselves in power.

Scuttle No. 2

As we have pointed out, thanks to the events of the last few years Woman Suffrage may be put aside unless it were decided to try an experiment frequently advocated in these pages, namely the creation of a woman's national council without any executive or legislative power, composed of women and elected by women for the purpose

Unionist Policies

of discussing questions primarily concerning women on which it is alleged that the House of Commons is remiss through lack of knowledge. If the right women came forward and were elected such a body might be most useful and any practical recommendations which it laid before Parliament would be assured of exceptional attention. We are aware, of course, that this suggestion is scouted by professional female agitators who aspire to seats in the House of Commons and in the Cabinet, but it is approved by a large and increasing number of thoughtful and serious women, and moderate Suffragists would probably regard it as a fair compromise now that they see that their wilder sisters have killed their particular nostrum. Fiscal and Imperial needs will obviously necessitate the construction of a tariff of a far-reaching character productive of infinitely more revenue than was originally estimated, armed with reciprocity and retaliatory weapons and opening a wide door to Imperial Preference—a policy which the scuttlers of the winter will find it impossible to abandon. Tariff Reform with the Empire left out is unthinkable. Then there is the whole constitutional question to be reconsidered *de novo*, and the Unionist Party will have to make up its mind as to the personnel and functions of a renovated Chamber, and however awkward the topic may be they must settle Aye or No as to whether an elective second Chamber is now an item of the Party programme. If so, for how long should the lords of Parliament be elected, what should be the size of the constituencies and the qualifications of voters? Above all, what should be the powers of the Upper House, as we are all agreed that the Parliament Bill is both an outrage and an impossibility. Is there any prospect of restoring reasonable powers to a purely hereditary body? Is it possible to have a mixed hereditary, nominated and elective body? Is there in fact any practical alternative if our new Upper House is to be a reality, to a second Chamber "broad based upon the people's will"?

Social Programme

THEN there is the social programme of which the general lines require working out, though we believe that an adequate Tariff Reform Bill would do infinitely more to raise our people out of their present plight than all the other measures that commend themselves to flighty politicians attracted by everything with a Socialistic

label. Still there must be a certain amount of social reconstruction after seven or eight years of destructive government, and it is evident that the Unionist party are alone capable of carrying out a serious agricultural policy and increasing the number of those with a stake in the country. We must not forget that the appalling appeal to the "have-nots" against the "haves" has coincided with a period in which our new cosmopolitan plutocracy has flaunted its wealth with ostentatious vulgarity, while the rise in prices has aggravated the problem of life in the small households of the country, in many of which, thanks in a large measure to unrestricted free imports, wages have not kept pace with the increased cost of necessaries. There has been a tendency in many trades for the wage-earner's position to stagnate, while there has been a prodigious advertisement of big booms and mighty dividends in great concerns, though small concerns which do not provide "copy" to the newspapers have read more about these booms than they have benefited from them. If the employed in many occupations have had a hard time, so have the small employers in all.

A Marconi By-election

Popular opinion on the Marconi Ministry had a timely opportunity of manifesting itself at the by-election at Newmarket, a constituency peculiarly capable of forming an opinion on the "pool" or "corner" or "ring" or "option" or whatever may have been the much disputed transaction in which Sir Rufus Isaacs and Co. participated. The vacancy was due to the regrettable death of Sir Charles Rose, who, though a Radical, was likewise a patriot and a sportsman. Ministers were singularly fortunate in their candidate Mr. Nicholls, who was regarded not only as attractive but irresistible to an agricultural constituency, having sprung from the labouring classes and made their questions his own. "Nicholls and a quid a week" was regarded by electioneering experts as an overwhelming war cry, and at one moment the Radical Press appeared to anticipate that the Unionist candidate, Mr. Denison Pender, would be destitute of support. The London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, who knows everything worth knowing, was able to inform his readers on the eve of the poll that "Mr. Nicholls's message of hope to the labourers has

swept everything else aside. It is perhaps the sincerest contest of recent years." For once we find ourselves in agreement with our contemporary. The Unionists could only hope at best to scrape home in the face of such prophecy, though Mr. Leonard Brassey had the hardihood to give a sporting electorate a tip for the double event, "Lorenzo for the Manchester Cup and Pender for the Newmarket Division." The result was simply stupefying to the Government and their supporters, and even the most sanguine Unionist was startled by the brilliant victory of our admirable candidate, the figures being:

Mr. J. Denison Pender (U.)	5,251
Mr. G. Nicholls (R.)	4,400
Unionist majority	851

The Radical poll was smaller than at any election since 1900. As compared with the last contest in December 1910 there was an increase in the electorate of 365, an increase in the total poll of 478, an increase in the Unionist poll of 864, and actually a decrease in the Radical vote of 386. Though we have never overrated the importance of by-elections, this is clearly one that counts, as it indicates if one may take the articles of the Radical Press when they were confident of victory, a remarkable reaction against our Marconi Ministry. It should stimulate our friends in the House. It makes the attempt of a discredited and dishonoured Government to grind out impossible measures under the machinery of the Parliament Act more hopeless than ever.

Duty of Opposition

THE Newmarket by-election coincided with Sir Edward Carson's revisit to Ulster to dedicate himself afresh to the cause of his countrymen, and it was naturally hailed with joy by our Loyalist compatriots across St. George's Channel as yet another indication that the British people are not behind the Asquith Government, whose single political preoccupation is to toe the line to Mr. Redmond and his Molly Maguires. It is indeed preposterous that our Marconi Ministry, robbed of every shred of moral authority and without serious popular support, should have the effrontery even to make a pretence of persisting in the policy of despoiling churches and dismembering kingdoms. We do not for a moment believe that

these objects will be attained, though when we are invited to indicate the means by which Liberal limpets can be detached from rocks we confess to being puzzled. When Ministers prefer dirt to any other form of diet, and when their supporters receive £400 per annum to flout public opinion by voting the Coalition ticket, they are admittedly difficult to dislodge as the men in possession. Nevertheless the brazen attempt of Messrs. Asquith and Co. to place their measures on the Statute Book in the present temper of the nation is such an outrage on parliamentary institutions that we cannot believe in its success simply because we cannot believe that the country has taken leave of its senses. It is the business of the Opposition to turn out the Government, and they would probably succeed before the end of the year if they gave their whole mind to the task, though we recognise the difficulty confronting the leaders through the crankiness of some of their followers and the miserable mugwumpery of many Unionist newspapers so-called, whose main object would appear to be to let off the Government whenever there is a legitimate chance of hitting them hard. This observation applies not only to metropolitan newspapers, some of whom appear to keep a pet Minister who must at all costs be protected, but likewise to provincial organs, especially in the north, where conspicuous Unionist journals devote themselves to playing the game of the Government by paralysing the Unionist Party. People who marvel at the political plight of Scotland should read some of the nominally Unionist papers published north of the Tweed, and that particular mystery will be explained though not the other mystery, namely, as to why they do it—a problem which no man can solve.

Marconi Committee

THE Marconi Select Committee is fearfully and wonderfully made and its ways are past finding out. What further surprises Mr. Handel Booth and his friends may have in store for us no man can foretell, but during the past month they have furnished much food for reflection and some occasion for merriment. The most serious evidence was that of Mr. Ellis Powell, the acting editor of the *Financial News*, which has set many contemporaries an excellent example by its invaluable and illuminating articles on this amazing affair. The comic element was supplied by Mr. Winston

Churchill, who made an egregious exhibition of himself before the Committee (April 28) and, either by accident or design, "gave away the show" and made the position of his Marconi colleagues more hopeless than ever. As every successive episode is worth meticulous scrutiny, the curious preliminaries to Mr. Churchill's evidence are noteworthy. Hitherto there had been protracted and mysterious delay in the appearance of Ministers before the Committee, and the continual suggestion of the *National Review* that they should without further ado give a quietus to Rumour was indignantly resented. In the present instance, on the other hand, there was an almost suspicious zeal about the extraction of the name of Mr. Churchill from a reluctant witness, and exceptional celerity about the First Lord of the Admiralty's melodramatic appearance within a very few moments as an injured innocent overcome by indignation at the treatment he had received from his Coalition colleagues on the Committee, because, strange to say it was the Coalition contingent who insisted on his name being mentioned, though the Committee generally are responsible for allowing him to depart without the customary cross-examination. Mr. Powell, in his examination-in-chief, had said "the rumours with regard to Ministerial dealings in Marconi shares first began to circulate in London about the end of April or the beginning of May (*i.e.* 1912). They were obviously designed to support the shares. Three names were mentioned, two being those of Ministers who are now known to have been actually dealing in the shares, and the third that of a Minister who has not been mentioned in the affair for many months past." The witness told the Committee that he disbelieved the rumour, and asked "with great respect to put upon you the responsibility of asking me to mention the name." The Committee-room was cleared, and on the resumption of proceedings the Chairman informed Mr. Powell, "The Committee think that a Cabinet Minister having been referred to, he should have an opportunity of answering the rumour, and when you have given it, we shall ask the gentleman referred to to appear at once before the Committee to have an opportunity of denying it." To this the witness replied: "Well, then, sir, in obedience to your ruling and with the reservation that I believe the statement to be absolutely false, the name is that of Mr. Winston Churchill."

Insulted!

AFTER another adjournment, Mr. Churchill was sworn, the evidence of Mr. Powell was recapitulated, and the Chairman said, "We wish to ask whether you have had any dealings in Marconi shares?" Mr. Churchill had worked himself up into a magnificent temper, regardless of the fact that up to this point the Coalition, from Mr. Asquith downwards (with the solitary and courageous exception of Mr. Massingham, the editor of the *Nation*) had been a unit in proclaiming the right of Ministers to speculate in any Marconi shares they pleased after March 7, 1912, especially if they happened to be shares in a subsidiary Marconi Company. Consequently the Coalition members of the Committee must have been as startled as everybody else that Mr. Churchill should deem his "personal honour" impugned. However, that was the line he adopted, and we have his sworn statement on record. It was highly characteristic, beginning as follows: "Sir Albert Spicer, I received at ten minutes to two to-day the following letter from the Committee:

SIR,—The Select Committee on the Marconi Agreement desire me to draw your attention to p. 435 of the evidence which I enclose, given by the Editor of the *Financial News*. In evidence to-day, the witness, when desired to give the third name, mentioned you. He did so declaring that he had no evidence and believed the rumour was false, but the Committee are of opinion, that, having been referred to, you should have the opportunity of answering the rumour with the least possible delay. They direct me to say that they will be glad to receive your evidence at 2 o'clock to-day or as soon after as it may be convenient to you to come.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

R. BULEY

(Clerk to the Marconi Select Committee).

Upon this Bombastes Furioso observed: "This is a very insulting charge that you have thought proper to ask me to come here to answer. I am bound to point out that it is a most insulting charge." Consternation among the Coalition on the collapse of the whole pack of cards.

The charge which your Committee, Sir Albert, have thought proper to summon me at a moment's notice to answer, is nothing else than that having had dealings in Marconi shares, I sat silent while friends and colleagues came forward and voluntarily disclosed their exact position—that I sat silent while they were subjected to gross ill-usage and covered with every species of calumny and insult—that all the time I skulked in the background, keeping my *guilty knowledge* [our italics] to myself and desiring to conceal it from your Committee. I say it is a very insulting charge, a most grave and insulting charge, and I do think that before I am asked to answer it I am entitled

in all common fairness of English life to ask what is the foundation—what is the evidence and foundation—upon which your Committee have summoned me before them this afternoon?

It is indeed a tragedy to be a colleague of Mr. Churchill. The Attorney-General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had expended themselves in demonstrating to the Committee—and their cause had been violently espoused in the Ministerial press, and had evidently convinced the Party, if we may take Mr. Handel Booth as representative—that their American Marconi investment had been of an unimpeachable character calculated to commend itself to the most exacting purist.

A Devoted Colleague

And here was Mr. Churchill bursting with the indignation of a second-rate provincial actor at the suggestion that he might have concealed some "guilty knowledge" of similar Marconi speculations. But what "guilty knowledge" could there have been to conceal, seeing that his colleagues had successfully vindicated their fair fame in the eyes of the Committee, and had established an unlimited Ministerial right to speculate, at any rate in all the outer Marconi Companies, which the Prime Minister had himself endorsed by the attitude he allowed the Government to assume during the Marconi debate last October. However, Mr. Churchill deemed anger the better part, and angry he was, launching forth into a furious diatribe, which was exploited by Ministerial newspapers as an argument for stopping further enquiries.

I do think that I am entitled to represent to the Committee and to the public outside the ill-usage to which individuals are subjected, to which members of the House of Commons are subjected in a case like this, when a Committee of their fellow members upon mere unsupported tittle-tattle think it necessary to summon urgently a Minister of the Crown to attend before them to give an answer on a matter which obviously affects his honour—to give an answer as to whether or no he has sat still while his friends and colleagues came forward and voluntarily disclosed their position—that he sat still all the time skulking in the background.

Mr. Churchill had evidently not paid his colleagues the compliment of perusing their evidence, and was evidently unfamiliar with the position so emphatically assumed by Sir Rufus Isaacs and Mr. Lloyd George that their honour was entirely unaffected by speculations in subsidiary Marconi Companies, though the Attorney-General recognised that a speculation in the contracting parent Company prior to the "announcement" of the contract

would have made him impossible in public life. That would likewise appear to be the position of the Cabinet generally, because Mr. Lloyd George remains at the Exchequer and has introduced another Budget since his evidence before the Marconi Committee; while Sir Rufus Isaacs is understood to be about to introduce a Bill for an additional Judge, and his name has been freely mentioned in connection with the Lord Chief Justiceship, though happily there is no vacancy. Like many other incidents, Mr. Churchill's attitude is utterly bewildering. The personal honour of his colleagues is quite unaffected in the eyes of their colleagues and the head of the Government by any of the transactions which they "came forward and voluntarily disclosed," and yet the First Lord of the Admiralty is outraged beyond measure at the suggestion that he might have made an equally innocuous "investment" and talks about "skulking in the background," when as we know there was nothing to disclose, as Marconi Companies were singularly suitable investments for his Majesty's Ministers—in their own eyes.

HOWEVER he refused to be comforted by the soothing syrup of sympathetic admirers.

Collapse of Coalition Press

I am grieved beyond words that a Committee of my fellow Members of the House of Commons should have thought it right to lend their sanction to the putting of such a question to me. Having said so much I will proceed to answer your question. I have never at any time in any circumstances, directly or indirectly, had any investment or any interest of any kind, however vaguely it may be described, in Marconi telegraphic shares or any other shares of that description in this or any other country of the inhabited globe—never. And if anybody at any time has said so, that person is a liar and a slanderer.

This fulmination should be directed to the address of the *Westminster Gazette*, the *Manchester Guardian*, the *Daily Chronicle*, the *Daily News and Leader*, to say nothing of the *Dundee Advertiser* and other organs of light and leading in the Ministerial ranks; and it may be hoped that their respective editors will take note of the suggestion that to accuse a Minister of the Crown of any Marconi speculation to-day is as wicked as it was in the happy days before the *Matin* case and the American revelation. If we don't know where we are in the light of Mr. Churchill's outburst, our Radical contemporaries certainly don't know where they are, because they have been at immense pains to explain to their

readers the innocence of the transaction in which the Triplets engaged, and that explanation is now part of the accepted creed of all thick and thin supporters of the Coalition. Our sea-green incorruptible contemporary the *Westminster Gazette* announced on the very day of the *Matin* case, which first disclosed the purchase of 10,000 shares in which three Ministers participated "except that the American Marconi Company happens to share with the British the quite honourable name of Signor Marconi, the transaction would call for no comment on public grounds." We are not for a moment questioning Mr. Churchill's statement that he has held no Marconi shares at any period either in his own name or in anybody else's, but we should like to know why it is wicked or slanderous to connect him with an unimpeachable transaction. The *Manchester Guardian*, which has always been one of Mr. Churchill's most enthusiastic newspaper admirers, thus referred (March 20) to the American investment: "They (*i.e.* people who honestly try to get at the truth) will find that the date of the purchase, the constitution and limited sphere of operation of the American Company, and the fact that the purchases and sales were made quite openly through the usual channels, remove the business far from any shadow of culpability."

Voice from Dundee

COULD any Radical Minister desire a more complete certificate of character than a declaration of the *Manchester Guardian* that a transaction in which he had been involved was removed "far from any shadow of culpability"? The *Daily Chronicle* categorically declared: "It is difficult to find any reason why the three statesmen (*i.e.* Sir Rufus Isaacs, Mr. Lloyd George, and the Master of Elibank) should not have bought them." While the *Daily News and Leader*, in a particularly cheerful article entitled "The End of a Slander" (March 20), thus disposed of the affair: "Sir Rufus volunteered the statement that, six weeks after the contract was announced and at the time when the Marconi shares (English) were at their highest point, he bought 10,000 shares in the American Company, a thousand of which he sold to Mr. Lloyd George. But the American Company had no interest in the English Company, could not enter into a contract with the British Government, and could not profit by the contract or any contract which the English Company made. It was an ordinary transaction which had involved the purchasers

in a loss." Nor did the *Daily News and Leader*, the principal Cocoa organ, leave the matter there, as it laid down this general proposition. "The probity of public servants is a matter of supreme national concern. We demand from them a standard of conduct that is above suspicion. We demand it because they are necessarily in the possession of our secrets and are the guardians of our interests. The press has a duty to the public in this matter, but it is a duty which should be done not for malevolent or partisan purposes, but in order to keep the stream of our public life pure." A hasty reader might conceivably have interpreted this as a veiled reflection upon Ministers, but they don't know their *Daily News*, because the article concluded: "The public have now some measure by which to estimate the venom and mendacity which has characterised one of the unpleasantest episodes in recent political journalism." Ministerial speculations in Marconi Companies "keep the stream of our public life pure." But the repetition of rumours concerning such speculations is the depth of wickedness. There is yet another Coalition journal whose judgment should be of peculiar interest to Mr. Churchill—namely, the *Dundee Advertiser*, that great organ of progress in the far North, which calmly informed its readers that the American Company in which Ministers had confessed to have speculated "has no connection with the English Company of the same name." After this tall statement it was not surprising to read, "But if the purchase had been in the shares of the English Company itself the transaction on the date named (April 17) would have been outwith (*sic*, ? outside) the scope of the charges made. By that time the announcement of the Agreement had been made and had had its effect, and a Ministerial purchaser would have been in precisely the same position as other men. But, as a fact, the shares bought were those of a Company which had no more connection with the Marconi Agreement than had the Baltimore Railway."

Soothing Syrup

WE cannot resist expressing our sympathy with contemporaries after their splendid effort to swear up to the Party mark that a Cabinet colleague of the luckless Attorney-General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer should come before the Marconi Committee and sweep away their laborious superstructure of sophistry. Mr. Churchill re-

mained furious, and Lord Robert Cecil was brushed aside like other members of the Committee when he sought to placate the irate witness, who repeated, "What public man is there about whom lies are not in circulation? If I were to contradict every lying statement brought against me since I have been a Minister, I could not get through my daily work. I think one is entitled to protest against such statements being made unless the persons making them have a good reason or some *prima-facie* evidence to satisfy them; and I should have thought that a House of Commons Committee—well it is not for me to make any comment." A Radical member of the Select Committee, Sir Walter Essex, tried a little flattery, but with no better success, "We were glad that one who in the opinion, I doubt not, of every member of this Committee stands for chivalry and high feeling and courage should come to the defence not merely of his own name, but of that of his colleagues, in so far as lay in his power." Possibly colleagues may be disposed to say, "Save me from my friends." The infelicitous Sir Walter Essex persisted, "You would have been only too glad, in the abstract, to defend your fellow members, I take it, against such a charge, as far as you were able. Therefore I think that in laying about you so lustily as you have done in this Committee to-day you might have that in your pocket as an evidence of our real interest not only in you but in our colleagues, and our belief in you." Mr. Churchill retorted:

If the statement had appeared merely as the statement of an individual outside, or of an individual and newspaper in the City, I should not have thought it worth while paying any attention to it—I should not indeed. I have seen things just as insulting said about me at different times, and I have paid no attention to them, having a good conscience, and knowing that this is the kind of method by which political warfare of a particular kind is carried on nowadays. I know that, and therefore I paid no attention. But what has annoyed me and grieved me so much is that a Committee of my fellow members, instead of brushing this stuff out of existence the moment it was put forward, should have asked me to come, and should have thought that my character was in such jeopardy that I required to hurry over at a moment's notice to deny the statement. I have tried to live an honourable life, &c.

The Net Result

THE net result of Mr. Churchill's performance was that there was no cross-examination of evidence in chief as amazing as any that has been given before the Marconi Select Committee, while the suggestion that Ministers may have speculated in any Marconi shares, whether American, Canadian or Spanish, is stamped by a col-

league of confessed "investors" in one of those companies as being about as disgraceful a charge as can be brought against a Minister of the Crown. The *Westminster Gazette* has valiantly tried to rescue the Cabinet from the appalling position in which it has been placed by Mr. Churchill's evidence, by pretending that his indignation was exclusively aroused by the imputation that he was "skulking in the background" while colleagues had voluntarily come forward and described their Marconi transactions. Unfortunately, like most specious statements of the *Westminster Gazette*, this will not bear examination, as our readers can see from our textual quotations. Moreover, the *Westminster Gazette* has explained from the outset that there was nothing calling for comment in the American revelations which are understood to be in accordance with the loftiest standards of latter-day Liberalism. There could be no "skulking in the background" when the transaction of Sir Rufus Isaacs and Co. was pronounced from such pulpits as the *Manchester Guardian* as having "nothing in them of which the most honourable man need be in the slightest degree ashamed." Would Mr. Churchill be offended if anybody circulated a rumour to the effect that he was an investor in the Baltimore Railway? Certainly not. But, as we have seen, his special supporter, the *Dundee Advertiser* declares that the American Marconi Company has no more connection with the English Company than the Baltimore Railway. Surely as much may be said of the Spanish Marconi Company, the Canadian Marconi Company, or other "associated" Marconi Companies. If Mr. Churchill's excitable evidence is to be taken seriously, it is a crushing condemnation of the Radical press from the *Westminster Gazette* to the *Dundee Advertiser*, as he apparently refuses to distinguish between *a* Marconi Company and *the* Marconi Company, treating rumours connecting his name with any of them as a foul imputation on his personal honour to which it was nothing less than an outrage of a House of Commons Committee to listen. The *Spectator* (May 3), makes this apposite comment on the First Lord of the Admiralty's lamentable performance.

> The attitude of Mr. Winston Churchill towards the Committee was indeed the cruellest blow that his colleagues have yet received, but it was also a blow at himself. If it is so outrageous to suggest the possibility of his having done the thing which his colleagues did, how is it that Mr. Winston Churchill finds it compatible with his honour to remain

in the same Cabinet with those colleagues? That is a question which we can assure Mr. Winston Churchill is passing, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer would say in his pleasant way, from foul lip to foul lip.

The Prime Minister?

AMONG other prominent public men whose positions have been made impossible by Mr. Churchill's outbreak is the Prime Minister, to whom, however, we need not further refer, as the subject is discussed at length elsewhere in an article entitled "The End of the Asquith Legend." We would, however, once more call the attention of the Select Committee and, what is infinitely more important, the attention of the public to the fact that on April 2 Mr. Asquith was asked in the House of Commons as to when he "first became aware that the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Lord Murray (the Master of Elibank) had purchased the additional 3000 shares in the American Marconi Company," the Prime Minister replied, "At the end of December last year or the beginning of January the present year." Mr. Terrell followed this up with the pertinent enquiry whether Mr. Asquith had "any specific information to give to the House from any other Member of the Government?" To this Mr. Asquith replied, "No, sir, certainly not." Mr. Terrell refused to be shut up and pressed the Prime Minister as to whether "in addition to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Attorney-General he had knowledge of any other members of the Government being interested in or having had dealings in the shares of the American Marconi Company, or any of the other Marconi Companies." To which the Prime Minister replied, "No, sir." We are a very long way from the comprehensive disclaimers of the Marconi Debate of October 11, and we must not forget that when Mr. Joynson Hicks (March 26) enquired, "May I ask the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Asquith) whether he does not think it desirable that these facts (*i.e.* the American Marconi speculations) should have been communicated to the House in the Debate which took place at that time (October)?" the Prime Minister made this sinister statement: "No, sir. I confess they seemed to have no relevance whatever to the scandalous charges which were then being circulated, *and I really attached no importance to them*." Thus the callous cynic at the head of the Government proclaims an almost unlimited right of Ministerial Marconi speculation. He must be left to settle matters with the First Lord of the Admiralty who passionately resents the connection

of his name with any Marconi investment as a base and wicked slander. We are even more interested to know as to whether other Ministers, outside as well as inside the Cabinet, accept the Asquith view that Ministers may speculate in any Marconi shares, except British Marconi shares, or the Churchill view that there could be no more devilish suggestion than that Ministerial Marconi shareholders were "skulking in the background" while gallant colleagues are in the forefront of the fight. *Pace* the Coalition-ridden Marconi Committee, the country is entitled to know how far Ministers have succumbed to the temptations which Mr. Asquith regards as of "no importance." We must insist for once on having the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Inconvenient Facts

THERE is no hope of bringing home any inconvenient fact to professional politicians. His Majesty's Ministers may not uncharitably be described as receiving princely salaries for gambling with the truth or acquiescing with the gambles of their colleagues with the truth. The Coalition rank and file receive £400 per annum on condition that they vote straight, *i.e.* support a crooked Government. They can neither afford to tell nor to hear any truth that militates against their paymasters. The Ministry of Mendacity is strongly entrenched, and we need not waste time arguing with the items composing the Coalition in Parliament. What we have to secure is that their punishment be adequate whenever the country is afforded an opportunity of passing judgment upon them. We are familiar with the view that a country has the Government it deserves, and that after a prolonged dose of Messrs. Asquith, Lloyd George, Churchill and Ure, to say nothing of the narcotics of Cocoa journals, which are calculated to chloroform any conscience, public opinion is so debauched that it is idle to expect electors to resent anything. We have been told, *e.g.* that Mr. Lloyd George's hold over the working classes has been in no way affected by his exposure as a punter on the Stock Exchange, though it is alleged he has lost caste by losing money on a transaction in which he had the opportunity of making a pretty penny. On this cynical suggestion the business of statesmen is to feather their own nests. We do not believe for a moment that any serious or numerous section of the community holds this

view. If they do democracy is doomed in this country, as in several other countries, to become a cesspool of corruption. The offence committed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Attorney-General, and the Chief Whip consisted in acting on a valuable "tip" from the Managing Director of a Marconi Company then engaged in negotiating a wireless telegraphy contract with the British Government, which was so far from being completed in April 1912 that it was only laid before the House of Commons in July 1912. It mattered comparatively little in what Marconi Company the "investment" was made, though there will be general agreement that no Marconi Company was suitable for Ministerial investments during the negotiations, or indeed prior to Parliamentary ratification, or indeed at any time.

The "Tip"

THE point was the source of the valuable consideration, *i.e.* the "tip" which was worth £20,000 on April 9, when it was given, and £10,000 when the shares were subsequently purchased ahead of the general public for £2 on April 17, whereas the great unprivileged had to pay £3 5*s*. at least when the London market opened on April 19. If the House of Commons whitewash this performance we may expect before long to have Ministerial traffic in Contracts which for the moment the Coalition Press professes to regard as an unspeakable outrage—we scarcely know why except that so far no Demagogues have been detected in such transactions. The attitude of the Coalition may be gathered from a scandalous letter addressed by a Radical Member of the Marconi Select Committee to the *Spectator* (May 17) containing this sentence: "I suppose this libel on me (of having libelled Sir John Ramsden) suits some party end and Tory papers will be repeating it for years to come—*like the lie about the Attorney-General getting a favour from his brother*" [our italics]. After that we know what to expect from the Marconi Select Committee, and we should be grateful to Mr. Handel Booth for his interim judgment, which robs lazy Unionist organs of the last shadow of a pretext for delaying to make up what they are pleased to call their "minds" on this matter. Mr. Booth's challenge is likewise valuable as a call to the upholders of Clean Government to get ready for the stern fight in front of them against the Marconi Ministry. A special effort should be made to bring home the elementary established

facts to those constituencies represented by so-called Labour Members, many of whom have forgotten their ideals in a life of "swank." It is a gross calumny on working men to suggest that they have returned Members to Parliament in order to condone improper Stock Exchange speculations and thumping big lies, which apparently form the sum and substance of "Progressive" Government.

Editorial Discretion

ONE of the minor episodes arising out of the Marconi Select Committee would appear to be closed. It is not without interest to journalists, as for the first time we have parliamentary recognition of editorial privilege or discretion, as we should prefer to describe it. On February 12 the Select Committee through their Chairman, Sir Albert Spicer, made a "Special Report" to the House of Commons which ran as follows: "That Mr. L. J. Maxse, a witness before this Committee, had refused to give information in his possession and to produce letters asked for by the Committee, which in the opinion of the Committee should be laid before them. He (Sir Albert Spicer) had, therefore, been instructed by the Committee to report the circumstance to the House, in order that the House may take such steps as may seem to the House proper and necessary." We append the official report of the proceedings in the House of Commons, where the subject was brought up by the Chairman of the Marconi Committee.

MARCONI COMMITTEE

EVIDENCE OF MR. MAXSE.

SIR ALBERT SPICER: I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, a question in relation to the report presented on behalf of the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company Limited Agreement, as to what action you propose to take in the matter?

MR. SPEAKER: I have read the report presented by the hon. member on behalf of the Committee, and it does not appear to me that I have to take any action—at least not to initiate any action. I shall act, of course, ministerially as spokesman of the House if the House thinks fit at any future time to take any action. But I do not think it would be according to precedent or right for me to take any action on my own initiative, and I shall wait until I am instructed by a Resolution of the House. I do not know whether the Prime Minister wishes to make any statement in regard to the matter. I think the indication should come from him as to what action he thinks the House might properly take.

THE PRIME MINISTER; Perhaps I may say that, like the majority of members, I have only had time to give a very cursory perusal to the Report of the Committee circulated this morning. I understand that the Committee has adjourned for this Session. In the circumstances, and having regard to the stage of the Session we have

reached, and of the importance, as all experience shows, of proceeding in matters of this kind only after full opportunity of consideration and deliberation, I am not prepared to assume the responsibility of advising the House to take any immediate action.

*CAPTAIN MURRAY: May I ask whether the Prime Minister will consider the advisability of referring the Report to the Committee of Privileges?

THE PRIME MINISTER: I do not know why I should do that. It is not a question of privilege at all.

MR. JOHN WARD: Does the right hon. gentleman think it necessary to take any further proceedings whatever relating to this case in view of the fact that the gentleman has refused to substantiate the accusations he made?

THE PRIME MINISTER: I do not think I could usefully add anything to what I have said.

We need not weary the reader by reciting any of the stale, flat, and unprofitable fulminations of the Coalition press in connection with this affair, from which one might have gathered that hanging, drawing, and quartering would be nothing to what would happen to the witness at the opening of the new Parliamentary Session on March 10. Ultimately the *Daily News and Leader*, which has frequently displayed intimate if not always reliable knowledge of the proceedings of the Marconi Committee, was obliging enough to publish an article entitled "What Mr. Maxse will have to produce," from which it might be inferred that the Committee no longer demanded the production of letters received but would confine itself to insisting on the production of letters written by the Editor of the *National Review*, a somewhat artless distinction without a difference, as there would be no point in producing a letter written without the name of the person to whom it was written, which would be tantamount to producing the letters received, and equally an impossible breach not only of editorial but of any other discretion. However, the suggestion delighted our contemporary, which had some time before with the same simplicity, which is its chief attraction, suggested that the private correspondence of the *National Review* should be seized under the Speaker's warrant. It should be said that these valuable hints were thrown out before the *Matin* case. Afterwards paragraphs appeared at intervals in various Ministerial organs announcing the particular moment at which the Editor of the *National Review* would reappear before the Marconi Committee where meanwhile Ministers were disporting themselves in describing their American

* Brother of the last Chief Whip of the Radical Party, the Master of Elibank, recently created a peer—not at this date known to be a Marconi "investor."

adventures. After waiting patiently until April 29 without receiving any intimation from the Committee, the present writer wrote the following letter to the Chairman:

National Review, 23 Ryder Street, St. James's, London, S.W., *April* 29, 1913.

SIR,—I write a line to say that I hav held myself at the disposal of the Select Committee ever since the beginning of the Session in readiness to resume my evidence, interrupted on February 12. After the libel action against *Le Matin* the Committee temporarily abandoned the evidence of journalists in order to hear Ministers. Leave was refused to counsel representing the *Outlook*, the *National Review*, Mr. W. R. Lawson, and myself, to cross-examine Ministers. On the conclusion of their evidence, which was interspersed with challenges to the editor of the *National Review* (notably that of the Attorney-General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer) came the evidence of brokers on matters connected with the American Marconi Company. I naturally expected to be recalled on the conclusion of this phase, but other journalistic evidence has intervened. I therefore feel constrained to write and ask w en the Committee will be able to hear me *inter alia* upon the points emphasised by Sir Rufus Isaacs and Mr Lloyd George, on which there has been misrepresentation, unintentional no doubt, of my evidence.

Members of Parliament and others desiring to appear before the Committee to clear up misconceptions have succeeded in obtaining immediate audience, and I respectfully ask as a matter of fair play that similar courtesy should be extended to me. A conspicuous instance of misrepresentation occurs in Mr. Lloyd George's evidence (1,825–1,868), in which not only the witness, but several Members of the Committee asserted that I had stated that Members of Parliament had been among the first to inform me that Ministers had speculated in Marconi shares, or had been guilty of corruption, and on this assumption Mr. Lloyd George strongly denounced such Members, concluding with this challenge: "If Mr. Maxse did not mean to suggest he got information from Members of Parliament, I think it is due to Parliament that he should say so and make it very clear." A member of the Committee, Mr. Falconer, was at considerable pains to drive this point home, and it was stated during the ensuing discussion that I should be recalled and cross-examined. Not to make this letter unduly long, I omit other questions dealt with by Ministers, and ask to be afforded an opportunity of reappearing before the Committee.—I beg to remain, yours obediently, L. J. MAXSE.

(Editor and Proprietor of the *National Review*.)

SIR ALBERT SPICER, BART., M.P.,
Chairman of the Marconi Select Committee,
House of Commons, Westminster.

On the following day Mr. R. Bailey, the clerk to the Marconi Select Committee, replied as follows:

Committee Office, *April* 30, 1913.

DEAR SIR,—The Select Committee on the Marconi Agreement desire me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday and to state that they do not propose to call you as a witness.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, R. BAILEY.

L. J. MAXSE, ESQ.

"THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM" IN HISTORY

WHATEVER differences may exist between the advocates and the opponents of national service, they all appear to be of one opinion as to the inherent value of what is termed "the voluntary system." Even those who have come to the conclusion that it is inadequate to deal with our present requirements have done so with reluctance and always with the proviso that it is in itself superior to any form of compulsion. Others less disinterested, like Lord Haldane, echo his words that our success has been due "to the bravery of military commanders who at the head of voluntary serving troops were able to vindicate the cause for which they fought." The present Secretary for War is even more emphatic. He proclaims himself "a passionate admirer of the voluntary system." "The old bedrock principle," he says, "that one volunteer is worth ten pressed men still holds good." It may appear almost blasphemy to question this "bedrock principle," but as most of the errors of the present day are due to incorrect data, it is high time that a thoroughly impartial inquiry be conducted into the so-called voluntary system with a view to discovering whether it is either old, or bedrock, or a principle at all.

And in order to judge the success or failure of this system we have to answer two questions: First, what task has it had to fulfil? What demands have been made upon it? Secondly, how far has it succeeded in fulfilling this task? It is evident that if it can be shown that it was an exceedingly limited one and that our present task is infinitely greater, our past history can afford little consolation for the future. Further, if it can be shown that the system did not even succeed in fulfilling the very limited task set before it, and that the whole subject has been overlaid with so much misconception, empty sentiment and loose

phraseology that at last it has resulted in the glorification of an empty and ignoble sham—if this can be shown, at least one plausible pretext for shirking our national duty is removed.

Now we cannot hope to answer the first question without first forming a clear idea of the causes which have contributed to our success in the creation of our Empire during the last three hundred years.

The history of the British Empire may be said to commence with the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, for it was that event which inaugurated an era of trade intercourse with, and of settlement and colonisation in, the New World. England was at that time peculiarly fortunate in being free from those religious and political troubles which were agitating the Continent. The struggle against heresy was slowly ruining Spain, France was exhausted by the Huguenot Wars, and Germany in 1618 was plunged into the Thirty Years War which reduced the population of the Empire by ten millions, ruined trade and industry, and from which Bismarck said that Germany had not recovered even in his day. Neither community of religion nor the relationship of the Sovereign with those who championed the Protestant cause induced England to interfere in these struggles. Dutch insurgents, French Huguenots and German Lutherans fought our battles and rearranged the frontiers of Europe while our gentlemen adventurers and sailors were engaged in "singeing the King of Spain's beard," intercepting the treasure-fleets of Peru and Mexico, lining their own pockets and incidentally building up our oversea commerce. It was under these conditions that the first settlements were founded in America. This freedom from any serious participation in the affairs of Europe lasted for one hundred years. During that period our naval wars with the Dutch certainly menaced our maritime supremacy for a time, but our much greater resources ensured us ultimate victory and enabled us to reap a still richer harvest of trade. The voluntary system is here seen at its best. Vast profits and an innate love of adventure are the mainsprings of action. The system is not quite so successful where the rewards are less substantial. When the plunder of the Spanish Main begins to diminish the press-gang is instituted by Charles I to provide the necessary crews for the Fleet and from 1625 onwards this inevitable offspring of the voluntary system is used in every emergency to fill our armies and

navies. When the New Model Army was formed in 1645 neither religious enthusiasm nor love of freedom, nor the promise of regular pay proved sufficient to raise the paltry total of 22,000 men required by Parliament. No less than 8000 had to be "pressed." So that more than a third of that Army described by Mr. Fortescue as "the finest force in Europe at that time" was not recruited by the voluntary system at all, but by the most unjust form of compulsion that can be conceived. Nevertheless, these are the palmiest days of the voluntary system both at home and abroad. The armies of the Continent were at this period voluntary in the sense that they consisted mainly of mercenaries who, as they could seldom depend on receiving pay, served mainly in the hope of plunder, and to this system were due the unparalleled horrors of the Thirty Years War. A striking exception to the rule was the Army of Gustavus Adolphus, the first European standing army and one in which the feudal system had become merged into a national organisation, knit together by iron discipline and religious fervour, but this army apart from its foreign levies was the very reverse of a voluntary one, being raised by a carefully regulated system of conscription, and its extraordinary victories were entirely due to the absence of those "voluntary" characteristics which distinguished the armies of its enemies.

Before leaving this period it is worth while to notice, for it is a feature of all British warfare, the minute scale on which our fighting has been conducted in comparison with that of Continental nations. It is well to remember also that although a national militia existed in the form of "the trained bands" "based on the immemorial obligation of all men to serve, if required, in case of invasion," they were perfectly useless. We read that in 1639 when war was declared against the Scottish Assembly most of the Army had to be pressed. They were raw and undisciplined, and were described by Sir Jacob Astley as "arch knaves." Even in the Civil War it is reckoned that only 2¼ per cent. of the population were in arms. While the Wars of Religion were devastating Germany and the civil war of the Fronde was reducing France to the last stage of destitution, while a poor and insignificant country like Sweden maintained a standing force of 80,000 men, while the armies of the Continent were enduring the appalling carnage of such battles as Breitenfeld, Rain, Lützen and Nordlingen, while the entire population of cities like Madgeburg

containing 30,000 people, were being put to the sword, our favoured people were enjoying a contest which had comparatively little effect on their prosperity, in which outrage was the exception, and in which the loss in battle for the winning side was only 1000 out of 14,000 at Naseby, 20 out of 16,000 at Dunbar, and 400 out of 28,000 at Worcester, while the utmost the defeated side ever appear to have lost was 20 per cent. This figure was reached at Worcester and was quite exceptional.

It must not be supposed that these figures are any reflection on the fighting capacity of the New Model Army, but the truth is that our Army neither at that time nor since has been asked to fight on a scale to which Continental nations are habituated. Our system would by itself have precluded it from doing so, for the closing years of the seventeenth century really mark the end of the voluntary system for every nation except ourselves. The mercenary system which followed on the decay of feudalism soon broke down. In an unsettled period where the most lucrative career was that of the soldier, where there was little inducement to cultivate the arts of peace, and where armies were necessarily restricted in size, there was little difficulty in obtaining recruits. All this is changed with more settled conditions, with the improvements in means of communication and transport. Henceforth the voluntary or mercenary system fails hopelessly to maintain armies in the field, nor has any great war in Europe ever been fought with armies recruited solely by this system. Compulsion was resorted to by Louis XIV, by Charles XII, and by Frederick the Great, and it is obvious that any great war, that is any war in which the whole of a nation's resources in men must be employed, necessarily requires compulsion. It would be perfectly true to say that the basis of Continental military systems was at that time universal service as it is at the present day. The permanent standing army was recruited generally for life (in France in the eighteenth century for eight years) by voluntary enlistment and by recourse to foreign mercenaries. The national militia on the other hand was raised by conscription, but in every emergency it was necessary to call upon this force to fill the ranks of the Regular Army. Nor were they of the calibre of the "trained bands" of England. On the contrary, in Prussia the militia underwent a year's continuous service and were subsequently enrolled for short periods of training. In all they performed no less than

twenty-one months. Such a system always appears to have been repellent to the British mind, which prefers the crimp and the press-gang to any legal obligation of service, but the point is that the system broke down just as hopelessly in our case, even with our very limited obligations, as it did in the case of other nations.

It has already been pointed out that until the closing years of the seventeenth century our immunity from any serious participation in Continental affairs enabled us to establish settlements in America, Asia and Africa, and lay the foundations of our trade both in the Old and New Worlds. The more the Continent was engaged in war the better for us. Our Army did not afford much help in establishing our colonies. Cromwell sent an abortive expedition to St. Domingo, and after fearful loss from yellow fever, Jamaica became an English possession. The fighting, however, was insignificant. The disgraceful failure of the expedition to St. Domingo was due to the fact that the 6000 men employed "consisted partly of drafts selected by Colonels and probably containing the men of whom they were most anxious to be rid, and partly of recruits drawn from the most restless and worthless of the nation." So much for the voluntary system in the time of Cromwell.

In 1689 these favourable conditions under which our Empire was created are modified. We are dragged into a great Continental war, a struggle which lasts at intervals until 1815. Throughout this struggle the small British Army has for its size a record second to none, but here again the task imposed upon it is a very small one. In order to see how small it is and how hopelessly the system breaks down even under so slight a strain we will follow as shortly as possible the main features of the war. And while doing this let us observe at the same time how we utilised the embarrassments of Continental nations to increase our Colonial possessions without any sacrifice to ourselves.

The press-gang which had temporarily fallen into abeyance under the Commonwealth had been revived by Charles II and henceforth it became a permanent recruiting agency for both services. In spite of the popular fear of Louis XIV, of Jacobitism and of Popery, the 23,000 men who followed William III to Flanders in 1692 were composed of the lowest classes. In order to maintain them in the field kidnapping pure and simple was sometimes resorted to. This army, though it fought splendidly,

was consistently unsuccessful. It was beaten at Steenkirk and Neerwinden, and the taking of Namur was the only redeeming feature of the war. So many Dutch and English standards were captured by the French that the Prince of Condé called William "the Upholsterer of Notre Dame." It must be remembered that in this as in succeeding campaigns our Army only formed a comparatively small though important contingent of the Allied Armies consisting of troops from Holland, Spain, the Empire, Denmark, and various German States.

When the war recommenced in 1702 Marlborough took the field with an army of 60,000 or 70,000 men of which only 18,000 were British. To raise them it had been necessary "to offer £3, or thrice the usual amount of levy-money, to obtain recruits." Parliament voted a considerable part of the money required for our Allies, but it was our treasure rather than our blood we lavished in the War of the Spanish Succession.

The first severe fighting took place in 1704. If we compare the losses of the British from this date with the total losses of the Allied Armies in the principal engagements we shall obtain a good idea of the comparative part we played in the war.

At Blenheim the total loss was 12,000, of which only 2170 were British.

At Ramillies, to quote Mr. Fortescue, "the loss of the Allies was from four to five thousand killed and wounded which fell almost entirely on the Dutch and Danes, the British . . . being but little engaged until the close of the day."

At Oudenarde the total loss was 3000, of which only 230 were British.

At Malplaquet the total loss was 20,000, of which only 1900 were British.

These figures are remarkable. They are no reflection on the British Army; on the contrary that army was the backbone of the Alliance. It showed itself capable of enduring a loss at one action, the Schellenberg, of over 30 per cent. and the same regiments suffered the heaviest punishment only a few weeks later at Blenheim. But whatever their fighting and marching capacity was, it is undeniable that at Blenheim they only numbered about one-sixth of the Allied Army and that in subsequent engagements the proportion was very much less. It is most important to recognise how very small was the task demanded of our military

system. And in spite of this trifling sacrifice we read that after Malplaquet the nation clamoured for peace, because they were so horrified at the appalling loss of life, though it had only cost us 1900 men!

It is true that this was not the only theatre of war. We maintained a force in Spain which at one period rose to 26,000 men. The campaign was disastrous though not inglorious. They were completely defeated at Almanza in 1707, and at Brihuega in 1710. The greatest number of troops we ever had on the Continent during this war was 50,000, but the number was generally less.

Now let us see how they were obtained. At the very outset, in 1703, a clause is inserted in the Mutiny Act "empowering the Queen to order the delivery from gaol of capital offenders who had been pardoned on condition of enlistment"! Whether this is a voluntary or compulsory system we can leave the "passionate admirers" of the former to say. At any rate "the competition for this class of recruit was so keen that a regular roster was kept to ensure that every regiment should profit by the windfall in its turn." "In the later years of the war the sweepings of the gaols were in particular request." Another method was, to quote Mr. Fortescue again, "the discharge of insolvent debtors from prison who should serve or procure another to serve in the fleet or army"; another was a Recruiting Act empowering justices of the peace to "levy as recruits all able-bodied men who had no visible employment or means of subsistence." In practice this affected everybody who was not a voter. Even this was not enough; bounties were increased and every parish received £3 for a recruit thus obtained. The abuses of the recruiting system became so bad that the system broke down completely in 1711. It is curious to note that an Act was brought in to compel every parish and corporation to supply a certain number of recruits, but was dropped as unworthy of a free country. Apparently a legalised press-gang was considered eminently worthy of a free country! In spite of all these measures vast numbers of boys and old men were enlisted who went sick at once, the burden of getting men was chiefly thrown upon officers who had to make good out of their own pockets the loss of recruits through sickness and desertion, and the Colonial service was so unpopular that wholesale desertion could sometimes only be averted by concealing their destination from the troops.

Considering the extent of our sacrifices we reaped a very good harvest from the Peace of Utrecht in 1713. In addition to preserving the balance of power in Europe and the recognition on the part of France of the Protestant Succession, we gained Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and the Hudson Bay Territory.

Our next two wars with France were on a much smaller scale, but before coming to them we may note the Spanish War of 1739, one of the most disastrous we ever waged. About 9000 men in all were raised in America and England and sent in 1740 on an expedition to Carthagena. Their attack on the place was repulsed and nine out of ten perished of yellow fever. The horrors of the campaign, due very largely to the force being composed of raw recruits, almost beggar description.

In 1741 began the War of the Austrian Succession. Early in 1743 we landed a force of 16,000 men on the Continent, the total Allied Army being about 56,000. The extent of the fighting may be judged from the casualties. At Dettingen the British lost 830 out of a total casualty list of about 2500; at Fontenoy, which, though a defeat, was one of the finest exploits of infantry in history, 4000 out of 6000. These losses represented 6 and 24 per cent. respectively of the numbers of British engaged. After 1745 our forces were still further reduced and in the two other battles of the war, Roucoux and Lauffeldt, we lost 350 out of a total allied loss of 5000 and 2000 out of 6000 respectively.

The manner in which the voluntary system worked at this period is interesting. "The ranks were filled in great measure by professional criminals who passed from regiment to regiment spreading everywhere the infection of discontent, debauchery and insubordination. . . . Week after week deserters were brought out into Hyde Park, tied up to the halberds or simply to a tree and flogged with hundreds of lashes." Every variety of scourging was employed, as well as more refined forms of torture such as "running the gantlope" and "picketing." With regard to our Colonial possessions they were garrisoned by militia raised by themselves, but in the case of the West Indies "the ranks of the militia were kept full by continual exportation of white 'servants' from England, that is to say of men, women and children saved from the gaol or the gallows . . . trepanned by scoundrelly crimps, or kidnapped bodily in the streets and spirited, as the phrase went, across the Atlantic."

It will perhaps be said, "After all it was a barbarous age and other armies suffered from similar abuses." Unfortunately this is not so. Desertion, it is true, was rife in the armies of France and Prussia and in the latter flogging was at one time much in vogue. But the Prussian was a heterogeneous army composed largely of foreigners, even national service being insufficient to provide the numbers of so sparsely populated a country. Also it was discontinued early in the nineteenth century and only inflicted for very grave offences in the latter years of the eighteenth century. One has only to read the memoirs of Sir Robert Wilson who had unrivalled experience of Continental armies during the Napoleonic campaigns to see, even as late as that, how scandalous was the administration of justice in our Army and how it lowered us in the eyes of foreign officers. But there is one feature of our system which is absolutely unique: to be a soldier was a term of reproach synonymous with drunkenness and debauchery, and indeed, how could it be otherwise when the voluntary system provided only the most criminal elements of society? In all armies at this time the discipline was very severe, the service unattractive, and recourse had to be made to the press-gang, but these concomitants of every voluntary system were infinitely worse in England.

We now come to the Seven Years War which lasted from 1756 to 1763. This war is most instructive. It represents the minimum of sacrifice with the maximum of benefit. The Continental war was of comparatively little importance to us as there was no serious threat to the balance of power. We therefore economised in this quarter, only despatching some 7000 men, afterwards raised to 10,000, to the aid of Frederick the Great, merely to encourage him to keep the French busy while we raided their colonies. This we did unsuccessfully at first but afterwards with great effect. So far our Colonial possessions had been gained almost exclusively by individual effort on the part of the Colonials. Such small expeditions as we had undertaken with Regulars were nearly all failures. In 1711 there had been a disastrous expedition to Quebec and in 1755 a few British troops had taken part in Braddock's American expedition and were totally defeated. All they had achieved up till then was "the credit of having taught New England to 'drab, drink, blaspheme, curse and damn.'" With the opening of the Seven Years War there comes a change. Leaving Frederick

the Great to fight some of the most awful battles recorded in history, in which the Prussians over and over again lost from 35 to 45 per cent., we proceeded to amuse ourselves by a series of "diversions" all over the world, sometimes to the coast of France, sometimes to Senegal, sometimes to the West Indies, sometimes to Canada. On the whole we were very successful, but in no case did we risk more than a few thousand men and the resources of our opponents were drained by the requirements of the Continental campaign. Even such a memorable exploit as the taking of Quebec by Wolfe was effected by only 8500 men, many of whom were Colonials. The war in Germany was carried on with varying success. Six battalions of infantry covered themselves with glory at Minden and though beaten at Kloster Kampen the campaign on the whole added greatly to their reputation. Having gained all we wanted, namely, the cession of India except Pondicherry and Chandernagore, of French America, Canada, Tobago, Dominica and St. Vincent, we concluded peace in 1762, leaving Frederick to fend for himself against the whole of Europe, a piece of selfishness which was only a repetition of our action at the Peace of Utrecht. Considering that at the commencement of the war we were in so disgraceful a state of unpreparedness that we had to call in Hessians and Hanoverians for our protection, it cannot be said that our success was deserved. Chatham's famous phrase "We will conquer America in Germany" throws a remarkable light on the part played by Frederick in that conquest, for if America was conquered in Germany it certainly was not we who did it.

It must be remembered also that our Army had up till now taken very little part in India. One battalion only was sent out. Our victories under Clive and other brilliant officers were won by Europeans and Sepoys raised by the East India Company.

In spite of the increase of our Empire our foreign garrisons in 1763 only amounted to 15,000 men. In view of the makeshift nature of our whole military organisation and its neglect by the nation, it is not surprising that when retribution came in 1775 in the shape of the revolt of our American Colonies, it resulted in the total loss of the most magnificent empire this world has ever seen. It is customary to ascribe this to an error in policy, to the folly of George III or the short-sightedness of Lord North. These alone would not have lost us America, and no man strove

harder for the Army than George III. It was quite as much due to the reduction of naval and military forces. We had reduced the Army to 33,000 men and as we delayed in raising recruits we had to call in 18,000 mercenaries from Brunswick and Hesse-Cassel to fight our own kith and kin. This War of Independence was the only occasion (unless the two Boer Wars be excepted) on which we have fought a civilised people without Continental allies, and it resulted in complete and crushing defeat.

It is now necessary to follow this wonderful voluntary system through the most illuminating instance of its working, the great French War from 1793 to 1815.

When France declared war we had only 15,000 men in these islands. In order to raise a force for service in Holland recourse was had to enormous bounties, but even so the vast majority were weakly boys and old men. In 1794 our forces in Flanders amounted to 30,000 men, one of the worst armies we had ever put in the field! Practically any one who could produce a certain number of recruits was given a commission. "Rich speculators bought the required recruits for their sons from the crimps at so much a head. The men so procured were infamous, and the officers not much better!" These officers were so ignorant of their most elementary duties that they had to receive instruction from their Austrian comrades. Many of them found the "ennui" of a campaign insupportable without the company of their mistresses, who obstructed the line of march with the baggage of their vast establishments. Sir R. Wilson describes how morning after morning men convicted of drunkenness were brought out, tied to the halberds and mercilessly flogged, the proceedings being superintended by officers who had not yet recovered from the preceding night's debauch. With the exception of the Guards and a very few other regiments who distinguished themselves by such exploits as that of Lincelles, the record of the Army is little short of disgraceful, and the campaign ended in total disaster. After this we took no serious part on the Continent for thirteen years. We proceeded instead to carry out our time-honoured policy of inducing other nations by means of subsidies to engage in a life and death struggle with our enemies while we reaped all the benefits. The most glaring instance of this selfishness may be seen at the commencement of the war. Instead of assisting our Allies with

our whole available military strength which would have enabled them to march straight on Paris, put an end to the worst government which has ever disgraced humanity, and saved Europe from twenty-three years of war, we chose to amuse ourselves by filching West Indian islands from the French, a course which could only benefit ourselves alone. Not content with this Pitt actually ruined the whole plan of campaign by insisting that the co-operation of British troops should be conditional on the Allies first undertaking the siege of Dunkirk, the reason being that "it was a port and would give a good impression of the war in England."

It is no wonder that the Duke of Wellington, who fought in this campaign, was hardly ever heard to mention it, and that every word of Burke's condemnation both of the conduct of the war and the selfishness of our military policy is endorsed by that most Tory of historians, Alison. "Great Britain blasted the prospects of European deliverance by the selfish direction which she gave to her efforts."

After this our military action was contemptible. We undertook the usual abortive diversions, landing a few thousand men at different points of the world, generally meeting with disaster, sometimes with temporary, seldom with lasting, success, never however having any decisive effect on the war. This state of things lasted till 1809 when we landed a force in Portugal under Wellington. Even the Peninsular Army, however, never numbered more than 40,000, the balance was made up of Brunswickers, Spaniards and Portuguese. It is easy to belittle the services of the Spaniards but, at any rate, they paralysed vast numbers of the French and harassed them to a degree we hardly realise. The reason this "diversion" was more successful than others was less that we had a great general than that Napoleon left us alone for three years, and then ignored us to such an extent that he assembled an army of 600,000 men for the invasion of Russia, leaving us securely established in the Peninsula, the troops opposed to us being the youngest and most undisciplined in the whole French Empire. Under these circumstances we drove the French over the Pyrenees. Now while we were doing all this, and while we were dissipating our strength in such ridiculous enterprises as those of Monte Video and Buenos Ayres, which only brought us disgrace, or of Walcheren where half the Army went to hospital and accomplished nothing, or of the West

Indies where 40,000 men perished and at least as many more were disabled for life by yellow fever, and innumerable others more or less costly, most of which were undertaken entirely for selfish reasons and could have no effect on the war—while all this was happening, let us see what other nations were doing.

Fron 1792 to 1795 Prussia, Austria, Holland and Sardinia fought France, in 1796 Austria and Sardinia fought her, in 1797 Austria fought her alone and single-handed.

In 1799 Austria and Russia fought her, in 1800 and 1801 Austria fought her alone. In 1805 Russia and Austria fought her, putting enormous armies in the field. In 1806 Prussia fought her alone and single-handed, in 1807 Russia and Prussia fought her. In 1808 Spain fought her. In 1809 Austria fought her alone, putting into the field armies numbering hundreds of thousands. In 1812 Russia fought the whole of Europe alone and single-handed. In 1813 Russia and Prussia fought her, afterwards joined by Austria and Sweden, in 1814 these allies at length entered Paris after desperate fighting.

Let it be remembered that the whole of this fighting, lasting with but very short intervals for twenty-four years, was of a character compared to which our hardest fights were mere affairs of outposts. There have been a few battles such as Minden, Talavera, Albuera, Waterloo and Inkerman, in which we have lost 30 per cent. or over. These have all been fought with very small highly-trained forces * never exceeding 24,000 men and where all those men were engaged. The French soldier under Napoleon would have looked upon these as skirmishes. For to him a battle was an affair in which you placed from 100,000 to 200,000 men in the field and lost from 40 to 50 per cent. of the number actually engaged, these losses not being incurred by seasoned and professional troops but by hosts of conscripts, driven into the ranks massed in huge columns and led up to the muzzles of guns discharging grape, canister and round shot into the closely packed ranks. And this they endured year after year till the supply of grown-up men failed, when recourse was had to boys of sixteen and seventeen who showed equal aptitude for being mown down but died like flies from exposure and fatigue. But if the French were pre-eminent in providing this "inlassable chair à canon," as

* Waterloo is to some extent an exception, as there were there a large proportion of militiamen in the ranks.

Houssaye calls the conscripts of 1814, other nations were not far behind. When we speak of "fearful losses" they are after all losses suffered by individual brigades and regiments. But think of an army of 138,000 men losing 45,000 and yet maintaining its ground. This was done by the Russians at Borodino. At Eylau they lost 22,000 out of 63,500. As for the French, in view of the tremendous calls made upon their population their record is even more astounding. At Borodino it is computed that out of 113,000 actually engaged there were no less than 47,000 killed and wounded, at Leipsic 50,000 out of 150,000. The Russian campaign alone cost the Grand Army 450,000 men, of whom 300,000 were dead, and yet four months after that appalling disaster, that devoted nation was called upon to raise a total levy of 1,300,000. When it is remembered that similar losses were suffered by Prussia and Austria and that they were endured principally by raw troops not seasoned veterans, representing the nation-in-arms not a small professional force, it is evident that such feats as that of Albuera, where we lost 3990 out of 8200, great though they may be, stand on a different plane altogether. And though these nations bore the brunt of the day, whereas we never risked more than 40,000 men, we claim all the credit for Napoleon's overthrow because we happened to take a prominent part at Waterloo, although in that battle we only provided a little more than a fifth of the total allied force, namely 23,991 men. Till a few years ago it was the fashion with us to belittle the part played by the Prussians in this battle, though they lost 7000 men, more than we did, and though Blucher's decision to march on Waterloo was without exception the most heroic ever taken by any general.

It has been necessary, at the risk of wearying the reader, to give this summary of British military history because a strange idea has grown up that we have beaten the world, that our military record is one of continuous and unparalleled success, and that we saved Europe from the yoke of Napoleon, all this being due to the voluntary system. Now, small though our Army was, we could certainly have saved Europe over and over again between 1792 and 1795, and we could probably have done it in 1800 and possibly in 1805, and again in 1807 when the Grand Army was floundering in the mud of Poland and the Tsar implored our aid. A few troops sent to the Baltic might then have turned the tide. Unfortunately

we were at that time bent on filching the Spanish colonies of Buenos Ayres and Monte Video. The plain truth is that at the most critical periods of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars we deliberately left our allies in the lurch because we were engaged in selfish enterprises, and on the most favourable occasion because we saw an opportunity of acquiring some rich settlements in South America. The result was that in 1807 the Tsar Alexander rightly furious at our selfishness made peace with Napoleon and entered into an alliance with him against Great Britain. Then ensued six years during which Europe was ground under the heel of France, a result directly due to British inaction. Over and over again we refused to save Europe when it was in our power to do so. So feeble was our action that we never even despatched as many troops to the Continent as we had done a hundred years before in the War of the Spanish Succession.

There is no need to dwell on the history of the voluntary system after 1815. In the Crimea we only sent 30,000 men to the seat of war. Until the outbreak of the South African War all our campaigns were against natives. The South African War cost us a great effort. At the very outset our military system broke down altogether under the strain and we had to make up the balance with untrained troops. The result was a host of "regrettable incidents" and a deplorable loss of prestige. The story is one of the improvisation of armies after war broke out, an operation only possible against an enemy possessing no regular army, this being done only at enormous expense. The decision was postponed owing to the disinclination to face losses which is an inevitable feature of a system which does not depend upon a manhood trained to arms.

Now, looking back at the way in which our Empire has been built we see that it began not in any conscious idea of Empire but in the desire of commercial gain. "Bold and energetic as were the voyagers of the sixteenth century," writes Sir Charles Lucas, "their enterprise produced no tangible result. The sixteenth century was the time of training, but the seventeenth century colonisation began." Practically speaking, the whole of our territorial expansion in three hundred years has been carried out by the sword, chiefly by individual effort, occasionally and sometimes disastrously, as in the case of the American colonies, by the Government. As a matter of fact, in the actual acquisition

of our Colonies the part played by the British Army has been very small. It must be remembered that India was administered until 1858 by the East India Company, which raised its own troops. Even in the first Afghan and the Sikh wars no more than nine British battalions and three or four cavalry regiments were ever in the field.

Attention has already been drawn to the history of the Continent during these three hundred years. The desperate fighting in which all nations have indulged was continued during the nineteenth century. In 1828, 1848, 1849, 1854, 1859, 1864, 1866, 1870, 1877 and 1912, wars involving one or more of the great military nations took place.

It is necessary at this point to lay stress on one fact of great importance. In three hundred years of desperate Continental fighting, we never once put a serious army in the field. On the contrary we contented ourselves with carrying out the diversions described above.

These are only samples of the way in which a voluntary army operated in serious warfare. In truth our military action for three hundred years has been insignificant, without weight, almost contemptible. Taking a loss of 30 per cent. as the standard of hard fighting, we find that on two occasions we endured about this loss with a force the size of one division. On perhaps half a dozen other occasions we have lost this percentage with a force the size of a brigade. It is no exaggeration to say that hardly a single great battle has been fought on the Continent during the last two hundred years in which individual divisions and brigades have not endured equal or greater loss.* We have never fought except as a small contingent of an Allied Army a single battle which a Continental nation would dignify by the name of a general action. To put it in another way: if every single victory inscribed on our colours since 1660 had been won by the French, and if a Frenchman were asked to compile a list of the fifty principal victories won by his countrymen since that date, it is very doubtful indeed whether he would include more than two or three, if any, from our battle-roll. He would consider them far too insignificant. We were fortunate in producing three very great generals, Cromwell, Marlborough and Wellington, and the record of our infantry from Agincourt to Waterloo stands very high. At

* Not infrequently such units have been practically annihilated.

times it has been recognised as being superior to any in Europe for steadiness in action and fire-discipline. In spite of all the disadvantages from which it suffered due to the voluntary system and its neglect by Government and people, both officers and men have shown throughout remarkable qualities of enterprise, resource, endurance and above all an indefinable quality which may be termed power of muddling through any situation however bad. Its salvation at certain periods when the voluntary system had reduced it to the last stage of degradation was due to the example set by a few regiments whose high standard of discipline no adversities could shake. One great factor has been that our officers were mainly gentlemen. To say this is, of course, to blaspheme against the great god Democracy, but Cromwell and Washington who were both democrats did not agree with certain modern views on this subject. Neither officers nor men have failed. It is the system which has so often led to disaster. When it is remembered what extraordinary military qualities have been shown by men brought from gaol or the gutter and by officers who have continually been asked to make bricks without straw, knowing that in case of failure they would be made scapegoats for the politicians, one cannot but feel what invincible soldiers our country could produce could we but call upon that educated intelligence and power of leadership which are latent in the race. But when all is said and done the fact remains that our military history is more insignificant and our military action has been more consistently ineffectual than that of any other European nation, more so even than that of the Dutch, the Danes, or the Swiss.

There might be some excuse for our system if it could be shown that, being an island, we did not have to undertake military action on a large scale, or that the balance of power on the Continent was of no importance to us. But over and over again we were drawn into a European war against our will, nor can it be urged that our statesmen did not realise the importance of military action. They did most fully realise it. But how did they obtain it? By paying mercenaries and by subsidising the armies of other Powers. As long ago as 1759 we had 55,000 German soldiers in our pay. As long ago as 1692 we were subsidising no less than 20,000 Dutchmen and Austrians. During the

Great French War our subsidies ran into many hundreds of millions. Yet, although we were giving bounties of from £16 to £40, we could only provide Wellington in the Peninsula with an army which he described as "the scum of the earth." They were in fact frequently the sweepings of the gaols. Colborne, who fought all through these campaigns, said that a battalion was fortunate which did not possess 50 per cent. of irreclaimables in its ranks. After a victory or during a retreat they dissolved into a drunken, murdering banditti. Three weeks after the battle of Vittoria, in which our losses were comparatively trifling, 3380 soldiers were still absent from the colours in search of plunder. It is worth noting that during the later stages of the war we could never have maintained our forces in the field without volunteers from the compulsorily enrolled Militia. Even this degree of voluntary effort would have been impossible, had we not enforced compulsion for home defence by means of the Militia Ballot.

To show the extent of our subsidies it is computed that every Russian and Austrian soldier who fought against Napoleon at Austerlitz in 1805 had £7 10s. of English gold in his pocket!

But if any further proof be wanted of the truth of Mr. Fortescue's verdict, that "the voluntary effort broke down hopelessly both for service at home and for service abroad," it lies in the fact that in order to bolster up this system there were passed between 1802 and 1814 no less than forty-three Acts of Parliament. The net result was 23,991 men, "the worst army Wellington had ever commanded," at Waterloo!

It will be said, "If this is an accurate picture, how do you account for the existence of the British Empire?" Now the British Empire is due far more than we realise to that "legion that never was listed" of pioneers, adventurers, settlers and merchants. But, speaking generally, we owe the existence of our Empire, first, to the fact that for two hundred years the Continental nations were fighting desperately with one another and left us comparatively free to indulge in our policy of grabbing possessions all over the world, secondly, to the fact that at such times as we were compelled to intervene on the Continent owing to the threat to the balance of power, we did so by paying other people to fight our battles. These wars were the main factors in the creation of our Empire, but although our troops performed wonders in

proportion to their numbers, the work was done mainly by foreigners in our pay.

And now let us ask ourselves candidly one question, for it lies at the root of this question of the voluntary system. Are those means by which our Empire has been created and maintained still open to us? Are we an island Power in the same sense as formerly? Is individual effort of the same value? Can some adventurous person fit out a few ships, sail into Kiel Harbour and repeat that form of operation known as "singeing the King of Spain's beard"? Are Continental nations so engrossed in their own squabbles that our fleets and armies can sail where they will? If war should break out in Europe could we buy boxes of soldiers all over the Continent and amuse ourselves by undertaking "diversions" in the German colonies?

One has only to put these questions to see how the whole problem has altered. And yet we preserve a system which never proved adequate in the past, which broke down hopelessly in every emergency, although the conditions which enabled us somehow to muddle through in spite of it have now disappeared for ever and are as much a relic of the past as the dodo and the mammoth.

Some people talk of the splendid patriotism of our people which has always risen to every emergency. Where do they see this patriotism? We may believe that it exists. There is evidence to show that the spirit of the nation is not dead. But when have our Ministers, the leaders of the people, ever called upon it or ventured to direct it? When, on the contrary, acting on the pretext that voluntary effort alone was worthy of a free country, have they not stifled that spirit and diverted it into channels which were essentially selfish and anti-national, till we have lost sight of our national duty in the struggle for our individual rights? Never once in our history has the manhood of our nation undergone any collective sacrifice for the country. On the threat of an invasion one hundred and ten years ago a large proportion came out, did a little gentle drilling, and then returned to their homes. That was the extent of their sacrifice. They filled the churches day after day praying that the Corsican Ogre might never land on these shores, but they never thought of crossing the Channel and fighting him. They left the gaol-birds to do that; it was "the scum of the earth" who formed "the thin red line."

When have they ever been stirred by such a wave of patriotism as shook France in 1793, or Austria in 1809, or Russia in 1812, or Germany in 1813, or the American States in 1862? What do they know of real sacrifice, of that intense devotion which carried the armies of the Continent through those awful months of slaughter in 1813 to the terrible culmination of Leipsic, where the raw levies of the nations in arms fought for three days and nights, quarter being neither given nor asked, with nothing to drink "except water from the puddles in which men and horses had bled to death"? In one engagement, that of Mockern, those Landwehr levies armed, many of them, with pikes gained a victory at a cost of 7000 men out of a total of 16,000. They called that a combat in 1813, not a battle! That was real fighting and more than that, it was real voluntary service. For those nations know what voluntary service means. We do not; we think it means sitting at home and paying somebody else to do the fighting. No blood-stained puddles for our patriots! They stayed at home and drank their beer. But although those nations know what voluntary service really means, they never relied upon it for they knew what a broken reed it was. Scharnhorst and the great men of the War of Liberation would not rely upon enthusiasm and sentiment however devoted. They enforced the strictest system of compulsion, and the most Democratic nation on earth, the United States, did exactly the same in their civil war. And before we leave this war of 1813, let us note a rather curious fact. Those Prussians who were really volunteers, burning with enthusiasm, with a desperate desire to avenge their country's wrongs, were beaten over and over again by French conscripts and were only eventually victorious when in a superiority of two to one. Those French conscripts were called out by an illegal decree before their time was due. They were mainly youths unfit for marching. They loathed the war. Thousands deserted and hid in the forests and were hunted up by detachments of cavalry. Yet though often inferior in numbers to their enemies they were almost invariably victorious. Now, in view of the fact that "one volunteer is equal to ten pressed men," this is indeed most strange. Perhaps our Secretary for War can explain it. If not the writer may perhaps be allowed to point out that history proves conclusively that it does not matter two straws whether a man is willing or unwilling to enlist. What does matter are the influences

brought to bear on him after enlistment—discipline, comradeship, leadership, tradition, the effect of surroundings, and last but not least the innate love of fighting.

Such instances must not, however, be quoted to prove the value of semi-trained troops. The lesson is not that untrained men are equal to trained soldiers but that both sides fought with equally untrained troops and the "pressed men" proved themselves generally superior.

And now, one word as to the working of the voluntary system of to-day. Some may think that because the crimp, the press-gang and flogging are things of the past, we are better off than our ancestors. On the contrary we obtain exactly the same elements as before. Here is what another passionate admirer, Sir Ian Hamilton, says in a book written at the bidding of Lord Haldane to advertise the system. See how he does it! "The majority of eighteen- to nineteen-year-old recruits enlist because they have just ceased to be boys and are unable to find regular employment as men. About four-fifths come to us because they cannot get a job at fifteen shillings a week. . . . The reluctance of employers to take weedy, overgrown, youths of seventeen or eighteen . . . is good for recruiting." In the Annual Report on the Health of the Army for 1909 it is stated that 90 per cent. of our recruits enlist because they are out of work, and that many are in consequence in poor condition from want of food. An officer with unrivalled experience of recruiting stated in a recent lecture at the Royal United Service Institution that 5 per cent. joined from a love of adventure or desire to see the world, the remainder owing to the pressure of misfortune of various kinds. Seventy per cent. enlisted literally because they were hungry. He described them as "conscripts of hunger." We know on the authority of Colonel Seely that one volunteer is worth ten pressed men. Will he tell us how many pressed men one "conscript of hunger" is worth? As it was in the days of Queen Anne, so it is now. Only we get even worse results. Let us compare the South African War with the War of the Spanish Succession just two hundred years before. Both taxed our resources to the utmost. The latter lasted ten years, the former two years and eight months. The highest number we maintained abroad in the War of Succession was 50,000. This we did for about one year. The highest number in South Africa

was about 250,000. This also for about a year. Taking the population of these islands in 1704 as eight millions and in 1900 as fifty millions, for the Dominions must be included, we find that we not only endured a much longer strain two hundred years ago but put an even greater proportion of our population into the field. Now let us compare the fighting capacity of our "volunteers" at these two periods. In both wars there were "regrettable incidents" and surrenders. Of Almanza in 1707 Mr. Fortescue says, "The British alone lost 80 officers killed and 286 captured, of whom 92 were wounded. The sixth regiment had but 2 officers unhurt out of 23, the ninth but 1 out of 26, and other regiments suffered hardly less severely." The rank and file suffered in proportion. At Brihuega they lost 600 out of 2500 and all their ammunition before surrendering to a force ten times their strength. That is how the gaol-birds, the insolvent debtors, the pardoned deserters and the victims of crimp and press-gang fought two hundred years ago. Anyone who wishes can compare the history of their defeats and surrenders with those of our five shillings a day volunteers in South Africa. It is better not to set it down in cold print.*

And yet one volunteer is worth ten pressed men! Perhaps our Secretary for War will tell us how much one honest Englishman with the courage to tell the truth would be worth in terms of modern Liberal politicians.

Perhaps it will be said the above comparison is unfair. The conditions were entirely different. No doubt they were, but what is the essential difference? Is it not that the "pressed" men of 1707 were worth ten of the volunteers of 1901 because the former had discipline and the latter had not?

The cup of humiliation is surely full when a nation prides itself upon a form of service which has always been avoided by the most prosperous and efficient portion of the community, trusting to bribery and misfortune to induce the least prosperous and most unfit portion to undertake it. When they call this service voluntary and actually boast of their patriotism, one does not know whether to feel more astonished at this extraordinary

* It is very probable that the prolongation of the South African War was directly due to surrenders of irregular corps at critical periods of the war. One such surrender is supposed to have been the direct cause of the breaking off of negotiations after the taking of Pretoria.

perversion of the facts, or disgusted at the hypocrisy of such an attitude.

The fatal effect of the voluntary system on our national policy can be seen all through our history. Our Ministers are carrying out the same policy to-day. We who abandoned our allies in the War of the Spanish Succession, who left Frederick the Great to his fate, who deserted Europe in the hour of her trial in the Great French War, are still proving that the legend of "perfide Albion" is no legend at all but sober truth. In the next war we proclaim openly that we shall take no risks. Instead of discussing how we can save Europe, Ministers are conducting an enquiry into the subject of invasion with the sole view of concealing the true issues from the public and providing an excuse for the shortage in the Territorials. We shall send out a fraction of the Expeditionary Force if we find ourselves in a position to do so. If not, France and Russia can fend for themselves. Also if they can keep Germany occupied we may grab a few German colonial possessions. We know of course that our salvation depends on the French being victorious against enormous odds, but we are deliberately gambling on the heroism and self-sacrifice of the French people, just as we have gambled on the heroism and self-sacrifice of all those nations of the Continent whose blood has cemented our Empire—the Dutchmen of William the Silent, the Swedes of Gustavus Adolphus, the Germans and Austrians of Prince Eugene, the Prussians of Frederick the Great, and the allied armies of the Continent who crushed the might of Napoleon.

These pages have not been written in the hope that our politicians will discontinue their efforts to mislead the public on these subjects. The demagogue cannot change his skin. But if those who wish to know the truth, and are not deceived by empty phrases, will believe and recognise how hollow a sham is our military system, it is hoped that they will in future strive for the only "bedrock principle" that has ever carried a nation safely through adversity, namely, that self-sacrifice and devotion which are represented by a nation-in-arms. For never has the strength of a great Empire rested upon so rotten a foundation as that idle mockery of true service, that excuse for national selfishness, ignorance and sloth which goes by the lying name of "the voluntary system."

PERCY.

THE FUTURE OF THE BALKAN ALLIANCE

It is too late for pretending that all is well with the Balkan League. Even in official quarters, where pessimism is generally discouraged, it is no longer denied that relations between the Allies have reached a critical stage. Many behind the scenes go so far as to predict an open feud on the conclusion of peace with Turkey. Neither is evidence lacking in support of this view. During the last few weeks Macedonia has been transformed into a vast military camp, with the Allied armies facing each other in battle order. Incidents such as herald impending hostilities are daily multiplying. The combined effect of all these symptoms is to produce the uncomfortable sensation that the shock cannot be long postponed.

It would form a sad epilogue to a noble story if what began as a crusade of liberation were to end in fratricidal strife. The situation abounds in themes for the moralist who has not been slow to make full use of the opportunity. Hitherto, most of the reflections inspired by the crisis have been in the spirit of homilies. The Balkan peoples are denounced as little better than professional brawlers, and the entire trouble is ascribed to national perversity.

In matters political, however, moralists are not always the safest guides, and excess of indignation may easily blind the eye to the inner meaning of events. The problem which confronts the Allies cannot be reduced into terms of right and wrong without overlooking some of its most important aspects. Nominally, the quarrel turns on the interpretation of treaties and their bearing on the situation created by the war. But underneath all these arguments there lurk preoccupations far transcending the scope of written or oral agreements. The question at stake is nothing less than the future balance of power in the Balkans. An issue graver than this it would be difficult to imagine, and the dispute, when viewed from this angle, no longer appears in the character of petty quarrel with which superficial observers have tried to invest it.

In examining the present situation in the Near East, one fact arrests the attention on the very threshold. Whatever else the war may have accomplished, it has not worked the miracle of which at one time it held such brilliant promises. The map of the Balkans has been transformed beyond recognition, and Turkey has practically ceased to exist as a European Power; but those who expected it to inaugurate an era of tranquillity have been disappointed. The failure of the war as an instrument of pacification is largely due to the very magnitude of its military success. Had the victories of the Allies been less decisive, conditions might have arisen more favourable to the cause of Balkan union. The sudden collapse of Turkey left a void which has upset the entire scheme of things existing. A smooth settling down on the morrow of such an unprecedented cataclysm would have been little short of miraculous and would have revealed in the Balkan peoples political virtues which flattery hesitates to attribute to the most advanced European communities. What is now happening may be a cause for regret, but to connect it with any special vices of the parties involved is to betray a strange ignorance of human nature.

The passions which the war has engendered are only partly due to lust for territorial aggrandisement. Mere thirst after conquest would have never produced such perversions of moral sense had it not been backed by the sentiment of fear and jealousy. This is clearly proved by the fact that feelings have reached their highest point of intensity where this latter element loomed largest. The Bulgarians have exhibited a degree of self-control which is in marked contrast with the conduct of the other Allies. This equanimity is the more surprising in view of the fact that the position of Bulgaria is well-nigh desperate. For months past, the brunt of the war has fallen almost entirely on her. On every side she is surrounded by an atmosphere of open hostility. By threats of invasion, Roumania has wrung from her a ransom for the Balkan victories, while in Macedonia her allies are preparing to dispute her lawful share and have massed against her their whole armies. So long as peace with Turkey is not signed she must remain immobilised in front of Tchataldja and Bulair. For a parallel case one must go back to the dark hours of Prussia during the

Seven Years War. But in the midst of all these difficulties Bulgaria has kept a cool head, whereas public opinion in Servia and Greece has parted company with all reason. It is not indifference to the issues at stake which explains this placid demeanour. When the proper time arrives, the Bulgarians will be found tough bargainers and determined to claim their full due. They know, however, that the position of their country as prime factor in the Balkans cannot be seriously affected by the results of the allotment. Even before the war, the supremacy of Bulgaria was hardly questioned, and the formation of the Balkan League would have been impossible but for this acquiescence in her right to leadership. With the disappearance of Turkey, this predominance is bound to be further accentuated and henceforth will have to be reckoned with as a political axiom.

The reasons which have enabled Bulgaria to envisage the future with tranquillity are for her allies a source of uneasiness. Servia and Greece have long watched the rapid and uninterrupted progress of their pushful neighbour with mixed feelings of fear and envy. Her seniors in point of time, they have been outdistanced in the race for Balkan hegemony. In 1885 Servia made a desperate attempt at grappling with the problem, but had no reason to be satisfied with the results. The doctrine of Balkan equilibrium was buried at Slivnitza, and since then Servia has had to rest contented with a secondary place. But the galling memory of defeat had never died out and probably plays in the present anti-Bulgarian agitation a larger part than most Servians realise or would care to admit. It is especially potent with the military party, and, as the latter is an important factor in the shaping of Servia's policy, it must not be overlooked in estimating the possibilities of the present crisis.

Antagonism between Greeks and Bulgarians is a legacy of the past. Their history is a long record of ceaseless struggle. When they could no longer war as freemen, the feud was transferred on ecclesiastical ground and there continued under the mocking eye of their new masters. Since their restoration to independent life, they have not been able to revert to the old tradition owing to Turkey's presence as buffer state. This involuntary truce, however, has not turned hatred into love. They are once more to have a common frontier and will thus be brought in direct contact. This is not the least important

of the changes wrought by the war, and its potentialities for good or evil are considerable. Greeks and Bulgarians will no longer be able to indulge their dislikes with impunity. They will be within the range of immediate reprisals, and this thought must influence their relations as neighbouring states. Similar conditions have enabled Servia and Bulgaria to live on terms of tolerable friendship, and there is no reason why Greece and Bulgaria should not evolve an equally satisfactory *modus vivendi*. The new situation will tend to strengthen the authority of responsible statesmen at the expense of agitators and mischief makers. But it will be some time before this improvement becomes noticeable, and the intervening period will be one of considerable anxiety.

The war has widened the gulf between these races by adding to the old stock of animosities a fresh supply of military jealousies. It has let loose over the entire Peninsula a flood of vanity which has upset the balance of a good many heads. A year ago, no sane Servian would have dreamed of pitting his country against Bulgaria, and this recognition of inferiority stood for peace. Now, every Servian officer is convinced that the result of such a trial of forces would be favourable to Servia, just as he is persuaded that the issues of the war with Turkey have been decided mainly by Servian valour. In view of the fact that the Servian Army has smarted for a quarter of a century under the sense of defeat, this change of spirit and revival of self-confidence might easily lead to serious complications even in normal conditions, not to say anything of circumstances at the present moment.

If this is the way in which Servians are wearing their laurels, it can be imagined what the effect of recent events has been on impressionable Greece. To the trepidation with which the war was entered has succeeded the feeling of boundless self-reliance. All sense of reality and proportion has been banished, and there is no exploit which seems beyond the reach of Greek effort. To Greece the war was a moral necessity, for she had begun to lose faith in herself. She has been suddenly rejuvenated and will once more resume her legitimate place in the family of Balkan nations. But what has been gained by war may be easily lost in the same way. She can least afford to tempt fate by provoking complications with her stronger neighbours. So long as the fortunes of the country are in the hands of M. Venizelos, it may be depended that Greek policy will steer

a safe course. He best knows what Greece stands to lose even by a temporary reverse and will not run unnecessary risks. But his authority has been somewhat overshadowed by the military party whose influence is being used in the opposite direction.

What has been said of Greeks and Servians equally applies to Bulgarians. Belonging to a less excitable race, they have been more guarded in their expression of feelings and have not taken the outside world into full confidence. The exceptional difficulties of their present position have made them even more cautious than usually. But this calm surface hides a whole ocean of resentments. They are angry with their allies whom they openly accuse of unfair play. Their principal grievance is that while they were pouring their blood in torrents, their partners were employed in a political campaign, pegging out future claims. What makes danger from this quarter particularly serious is that the Bulgarians are persistent in purpose, and neither forget nor forgive. The situation will become infinitely more critical with the termination of the Turkish War, which will leave their hands elsewhere more free. And as that moment is bound to coincide with the division of the spoils, the chances of avoiding an armed conflict between the Allies will become faint indeed.

Such are the conditions in which the latest Balkan crisis has arisen. With relations between the Allies strained to the breaking point, and a whole stock of fresh difficulties ahead, only incurable optimism could entertain hopes for the preservation of the Balkan League. An ordeal of this searching character would have dissolved ancient friendships and sapped the foundations of long-standing treaties. The alliance between the Balkan States, however, was not intended to be more than a temporary arrangement, with a definite object in view. With the conclusion of peace, the various treaties and conventions on which it reposes will automatically lapse, and the combination which demolished the Ottoman might in Europe will die a natural death. When this pregnant scheme was being worked out, its authors were, no doubt, inspired by the noble hope that it may eventually prove the beginning of a new era for the Balkan peoples. But those best conversant with local conditions knew all along that, whatever the merits of the League as a fighting engine, with respect to this higher object it was only a long step in the right direction. The League was from the very first foredoomed to a brief career;

but that it should disappear from the scene under the cursings of its principal beneficiaries will always form one of the most instructive chapters in the history of popular ingratitude.

Meanwhile, the Balkans are confronted by the prospect of a long period of stress and storm. How matters will exactly shape themselves it is too early yet to predict. The course of future events will greatly depend upon the manner in which the problem of war spoils is solved. If means are found of avoiding an open breach of peace, time may be expected to prove the healer of many wounds which the last few months have reopened. But, as the situation stands at the time of writing, such a friendly understanding appears highly improbable. Passions are hourly growing in volume, and the voice of reason and prudence is lost in the din of bitter controversy. In Servia more especially, demagogues, backed by the military faction, are at the helm of the ship and are steering it straight into the rocks. Greece, too, seems in danger of succumbing to the temptation of what appears a supremely favourable opportunity for settling old scores. The combined movements of the Greek and Servian armies in Macedonia are a significant symptom and indicate that there is more than mere gossip in the reports of a Servo-Greek *entente* against Bulgaria. Fear and jealousy of the latter country supply the two parties with a common platform, and will probably result in a more definite arrangement. A sort of Balkan equilibrium might thus be established which will greatly assist the cause of peace in that part of Europe.

The outbreak of a fresh Balkan war would, in the present circumstances, prove little short of a world-wide calamity. Should, however, Europe succeed in localising such a conflict, its miseries will, to a certain extent, be compensated by one very important advantage. A trial of forces between the various Balkan competitors will clear the atmosphere and settle in the only efficacious way the sore problem of Balkan hegemony, which is at the bottom of Balkan unrest. It will fix for a long term of years the respective positions of the parties. Just as the Servo-Bulgarian War in 1885 proved a blessing in disguise, so this time also the arbitrament of the sword might create conditions more favourable to the political stability of the Peninsula. And this will be a gain not only to the Balkan nations, but to the whole of Europe.

BULGARIAN.

NATIONAL SERVICE IDEALS

I*

My Lord Mayor and Gentlemen,—It would be very difficult for me to overstate the deep pleasure which your generous welcome affords me, nor could I easily overstate the value which I attach to this great meeting, and to its significance in the movement for establishing in these islands a Citizen Army worthy of the ancient renown of this nation and the present magnitude of this Empire. This crowded hall is a sign, I think, of one of the greatest revolutions of public opinion in this country that the history of the past three-quarters of a century affords. For consider but a single fact as an illustrative proof of this revolution, of this swing round in public opinion. In September last, when I had the pleasure of addressing a meeting in the city of Norwich, though the meeting, so far as numbers were concerned, was a great success, the general interest manifested in the cause of the National Service League was lukewarm or coldly indifferent. We feared, even the most hopeful of us, at that date that we were fighting a losing battle. It seemed that it was beyond human power to rouse this country from the torpor into which it had sunk. Seven months have passed, and where there was nothing but discouragement there is to-day nothing but hope and confidence, born of the conviction that the young men of this nation are at last awaking to a sense of their proud and inherited birthright; the right and privilege, that is to say, for every man of them, high or low, rich or poor, to prepare himself to take his place side by side on the field of battle if at any time the honour or security of these islands is presumptuously assailed. That is the spirit which is awake in the nation;

* A speech delivered by Field-Marshal Earl Roberts, V.C., K.G., at Leeds, April 18, 1913.

that is the spirit which in the cities and in the towns, in county and shire, inspires public feeling, and mirrors itself day by day and week by week in a certain proportion of the Press of every shade of political opinion.

But, it may be asked, what of the politicians? What of the Cabinet and its members? Well, the politicians, I confess, are for the most part still blind or indifferent to this new spirit abroad in the nation; but it is to you, gentlemen, that I must look to open their eyes and disturb their indifference. And I would remind you of the great change which has silently taken place in the relations between Parliament and the nation, and between representatives and their constituents.

There was a time when our political leaders were also national leaders, when all our reforms not only took definite shape in one or other of the two Houses of Parliament, but also originated in the members composing those Houses. But since the seventeenth century the nation itself has come into its inheritance; the great principle of democracy has triumphed; the originative and initiative power has passed from Parliament to the people; and therefore it is that, whether at Manchester or Bristol, at Wolverhampton or here to-night at Leeds, in advocating a reform as momentous as any reform either of the seventeenth or nineteenth centuries, it is to the nation itself and to the people I appeal. For ultimately it is the nation itself, and the nation only, which, in the nature of things, is superior alike to party interests and to party prejudices. And, gentlemen, in this appeal, in this hope of a temperate and unprejudiced hearing, in my exposition of a radical and most pressing reform, to what city could I turn with greater certainty than just this city of Leeds, throbbing in all its network of streets with fresh and energetic life? Your University is already making a name for itself amongst the great teaching institutions of this country. Your technical colleges and libraries, your debating societies and schools, prepare for or continue the influence of that University, and impart to the political decision of Leeds that weight and that tolerance which education alone can confer. What, then, is this reform, this radical and democratic reform which I advocate, and with what message have I come amongst you to-night?

Gentlemen, it is a very simple matter. Here in Leeds, I am

told, you are jealous of your political independence, and you regard with just suspicion any attempts to infringe your freedom, that liberty of the subject, unmatched in other nations, which centuries of our history have slowly evolved. I am here to-night to urge you to complete that freedom and to perfect that independence. Such, and no other, is the radical reform to which I have referred. I am here to appeal to you to complete that process of enfranchisement which was begun by the great statutes of the seventeenth century, and still further developed by the Reform Acts of the nineteenth—the Act of 1832 and the Act of 1867. For, gentlemen, I maintain that your enfranchisement is not fully realised, nor your full citizenship attained, until, in addition to the right of voting for your country's Parliament, you have also acquired the right and the power to defend that country in arms; and that right and that power you can only exercise yourselves. You may get another man to represent you in Parliament, but, in the hour of danger to your home and your country, you must stand in the ranks of battle yourselves—or, I affirm, if you send another in your place whilst you still possess your own strength and your own manhood, you diminish by that act the freedom of which you are so justly proud and the political independence of which you are so rightly jealous; you become, in a word, the dependents, and, I had almost said, the slaves, of those whom you thus send forth to battle in your place. For that most ancient maxim of our race is a true maxim—the maxim which on this campaign I have more than once cited, "He alone is a free man who, when his country is attacked, has the power and the will to defend that country in arms."

Who and what gave you the freedom of which as Britons you are so proud? The spirit of the great Britons of the past—the readiness of all classes to set honour before life. Will you, the workers of this nation, accept that liberty like an alms and yet call yourselves "free"? Gentlemen, it cannot be done. You yourselves in your hearts feel that it cannot be done. You cannot have freedom on those terms; and if you could have liberty on those terms, it would be a dependent and a despicable liberty, unworthy alike of Englishmen, Scotsmen, or Irishmen. No man can be free who does not possess within himself the will and the power to defend that freedom in his country's cause as in his own.

Such is my message.

Now there are certain misunderstandings or misrepresentations of that message which I desire once and for all to clear away from your minds. From my first connection with this movement for Universal Training, seven years ago, I have fought for the cause steadfastly, if inadequately, and I have always, I hope, fought with the weapons of candour and truth. At my years, and at this period of my career, what personal ends can even my opponents attribute to me? I have acted but for my country. My indignation is therefore the greater, my disappointment the more painful, to find my words and my purposes so persistently, so shamelessly, and so recklessly misrepresented. I refer, for example, to the use which, since my speeches at Bristol and at Wolverhampton, has been made of the word "conscription." Well, gentlemen, there is nothing in the word itself that is odious or discreditable. The word "conscript" is not synonymous with "convict." The term "conscription," like the thing itself, is Roman, and in Latin the word "conscription" simply meant the insertion on the public registers of the names of all able-bodied citizens capable of service in the field. In Roman history, therefore, the word "conscript" was a badge of honour, not of injustice or oppression. In modern times, however, a cloud of mistrust and odium has undoubtedly grown up round the name. But, gentlemen, what is the cause of this? There are doubtless several causes, arising from the peculiar circumstances of the various countries in which this system prevails; but there is one cause to which to-night I particularly wish to invite your attention and the attention of my critics.

During the Napoleonic wars, Prussia and several of the smaller German States became practically tributary provinces of France; and under the specious name of "allies" the youth of Germany were compelled, as the Emperor William II pointed out only the other day, to undergo that last and most frightful of all humiliations—they were compelled to enrol themselves in the armies of their conqueror, and to take part in victories which riveted their own chains. And what brought this measureless humiliation on Prussia? I will answer you. Prussia trusted to her past victories instead of to her immediate efficiency for war. When everywhere in Europe there was preparation, she alone stood aloof,

confident in her immunity from danger and relying blindly on the victories of Frederick the Great. Therefore disaster overtook her, and she had to see her sons forced to fight under the very banners of her conqueror. Gentlemen, which line of policy—the self-satisfied inaction recommended by my opponents, or the energetic preparation for any emergency which, warned by the times, I wish this nation to adopt—which line of policy, I ask, is the more likely to bring that humiliation upon Great Britain? You are men of education here in Leeds. I leave you to draw the inference for yourselves.

Let me pass to a second point—the difference between the system of National Service which I advocate, and the system of conscription as it is established in Germany, France, Austria, Italy, Spain, and Russia at the present day. There are certain local distinctions, but in those countries, generally speaking, every young man at the age of twenty is compelled to spend at least two entire years, month by month, week by week, as a soldier in camp or in barracks. During that period of at least twenty-four months he can return neither to his trade nor profession. What, on the other hand, are the requirements of the National Service League? And how does the Citizen Army differ from the Continental Conscript Army? First of all, in the matter of time, we require that every young man on reaching the age of eighteen should give a short period, not exceeding a few months in the first year and a few weeks in the second and third years, to discipline, drill and musketry—just enough, in a word, to make him feel within himself the power efficiently and honourably to take his place in the firing line should this country ever be invaded. That is the utmost that the National Service League demands, and that is what our critics on the platform and in the Press have denounced as slavery and as a blood tax! That is the system which one of the most prominent London newspapers, a few weeks ago, denounced as a system which compelled the mothers of Britain "to send their children through the fire to Moloch"! What is one to think either of the honour or the patriotism, of the fairplay, or even of the common sense, of such critics and such newspapers? What do you, the men and women of Leeds, think of them?

Here to-night I in turn appeal to the mothers of Britain. Will you, I ask, prevent your sons from acquiring that noble privilege

to which I have referred? Will you not rather exhort and encourage them to take their places for so brief a period in that school and exercise ground where the youth of all classes and of all ranks shall assemble in generous emulation, solicitous only to acquire the power to serve their country if the day of extreme danger should ever come? For in that school they will attain not only true freedom and true citizenship, but all those qualities of mind and body—promptness in action, fortitude, self-reliance, presence of mind, health and endurance—qualities which will enable you, their mothers, to look on them with pride and admiration. And similarly to you, the men of Leeds, I put once more the question: Where, unless in that school and exercise ground, can you hope to win that freedom of which I have spoken? For what is freedom? Freedom is the power to realise that which is highest in each of you. It is the power to take upon yourselves the highest duties, whether as citizens or men; and I say to you again, you will never possess that power, you will never possess that freedom, if on the day of danger, if on the day that an invader actually lands on these shores, you do not feel in yourselves the quiet confidence of soldiers and of men, but stand helpless and bewildered whilst a handful of your more patriotic, more energetic fellow citizens, who have prepared themselves for the crisis, go out to meet the foe.

Thus far I have spoken of the time of training—the briefest necessary to acquire the discipline indispensable in modern war. Let me now, in the second place, refer shortly to the duties which this Citizen Army will be expected to perform, as well as to the duties which it will *not* be expected to perform. It will be an Army exclusively for Home Defence—an Army in which the youths of every class will be required to serve on the same terms. Upon that head I wish to be perfectly clear: there will be no respect of persons. It will be an Army that will not be called upon to fight until the invader has actually landed on these shores; and if any man of that Army ever goes abroad to serve with the Expeditionary Force, it will be because he himself wishes and volunteers to go, not because the State forces him to go. Again, this Citizen Army will in no circumstances and in no place be required to aid in putting down strikes. No Government would dare to use such a force for such a purpose. Nor will men who—

like that grave and sincere body of religionists, the Quakers—have deep-rooted and conscientious scruples against war be compelled to take up arms. For them suitable ways of helping their country will be found. And I would remind them that the surest way of preventing war is to be prepared for it.

And now let me say one word to the young men of this city, to the apprentices in trades of every description. I have no wish to minimise the sacrifice which the surrender of even a few months of your time will entail, but in what greater cause could you make such a sacrifice? And at what period of your lives could such a sacrifice fall more fittingly? Between eighteen and twenty-one you are passing from youth to manhood. It will not be all sacrifice either, there will be much gain. In the school and exercise ground of the Citizen Army you will break the routine of your trade and daily avocation, and amid new scenes and an invigorating and fresh environment you will have more leisure and thus acquire a better insight to face the problems of that critical age. And what is more excellent than that, when all your faculties are still buoyant and elastic, you should have time to reflect upon the responsibilities of coming manhood and coming citizenhood? Nor, as I have already pointed out, will the time thus given to your country be all a loss to yourselves either morally or materially. During the few months of training, in addition to good food, good lodging, and good clothes, you will receive a moderate weekly pay, and I need hardly say that you, the citizen soldiers of the nation, shall most certainly have your job absolutely secure at the expiration of your training. As I said at Wolverhampton, "the nation and the Government, by special arrangement with every employer, will guarantee the safety of your employment." You shall return to it honoured by your fellow workmen, and raised in your own self-respect by the consciousness of a duty nobly performed. Such are some details which I wished, if possible, to place beyond the reach of controversy.

Now, gentlemen, one last word. I have thought much and often of this reform during the past seven years. I have carefully considered the arguments brought against it. I have meditated much on the relations, strategic and political, of this nation and these islands to other Powers, and I am quite conscious of the magnitude of the change which I advocate; but I say to you

to-night, that if ever there were a reform necessary and imperative, it is this reform; and if ever there was a duty incumbent on the young men of Great Britain, it is this duty. You may never have to aim a rifle at an enemy on these shores, and I trust in God you never may; but you ought for your own sakes, and for your country's sake, to look upon it as your sacred and appointed task to acquire that power and the skill to apply it effectively.

My Lord Mayor and gentlemen, I have not this evening said a word, you will have observed, as to the increase in the armaments of Europe, of the improvements in long-range weapons, in the speed of warships, and in aerial navigation, which diminish day by day our once boasted insular security and inaccessibility; nor have I spoken of the breakdown of the voluntary system for the Home Army, now patent to every judgment not encased in prejudice. I have taken it for granted that you, the citizens of this great city, are readers of the newspapers, and that you have formed your own opinions upon the significance of such obvious facts as these. Therefore to-night I have attempted to base the justice of my reform on those broad and unchanging principles which in all times and places govern the healthy activities of Empires and great nations. And why have I chosen this line of argument? Because, gentlemen, I came to this city to-night, not in anxiety, not in uncertainty. I came to this city, famous for the part which in the past it has played in many worthy reforms; I came to Yorkshire, famous for the courage of its soldiers in battle, as those tattered flags drooping from their staves in York Minster attest; I came, I say, not as one who fears the issue, but confident that for the final victory of my cause I could look to the support of the men of Leeds and the men of Yorkshire. In the action which I hope will follow the deliberate appeal that in this campaign I am making from the Parliament to the nation, from the politicians to the people, your position, I am convinced, in forcing the weight of the nation's opinion and conviction upon the Parliament and upon the politicians—your position, I say, I am convinced, will be in the vanguard in this fight for reform. Men of Leeds and Yorkshire, can it be that my confidence in you is a misplaced confidence?

II*

My Lord Duke and Gentlemen,—It is with the liveliest gratification that I see before me this immence meeting in this famous hall. Four months ago I began at Bristol the present campaign for a great national reform, and I cannot but esteem it a privilege that to-night I find myself addressing such a representative Scottish audience in this, the second city of the Empire. For, gentlemen, what is the central motive and main purpose of that campaign except to establish upon surer foundations the greatness of this nation and this Empire, and to suggest measures for the continuance of that greatness more consonant with the circumstances of our time and the progress other nations are making—a progress which, alike on the shores of these islands and on our land frontiers of India, and of Africa, of Egypt, and of our Colonies and Dependencies in the Southern Seas, has rendered obsolete our former methods of defence? Yet, as I have recently demonstrated at Wolverhampton and at Leeds, our Government shows no adequate sense of the significance of those changed circumstances and times. Everywhere there is advance—in Russia, in Austria, in Germany, in France, in Japan: Britain alone stands still, repeating the old watchwords, recklessly trusting to worn-out systems and discredited principles.

But with whom, then, you will ask, does the responsibility for this dangerous inaction rest?

The immediate responsibility, I answer, rests indisputably with the Government and with the politicians of both parties who have done nothing, and do nothing to instruct the nation in what a changed and changing Europe and a changed and changing world we exist, so far as war and the preparation for war are concerned. On the other hand, there is truth in the maxim that every nation has the government it deserves; and in a democracy above all, where the government has become representative in the strictest sense of that word, and, in theory at least, is the mere agent of the national will, it is with the nation itself that the ultimate responsibility remains; and if a great disaster should overtake us, it is upon

* A speech delivered by Field-Marshal Earl Roberts, V.C., K.G., at Glasgow, May 6, 1913.

us and upon our generation that the suffering and the shame will deservedly be visited, and it is upon us and upon our generation that the condemnation of history will permanently fall. Therefore, gentlemen, it is to the nation itself that throughout this campaign I have consistently appealed; and in what city or in what corner of the Empire could I more fitly urge that appeal than in this city, which, alike in its past traditions and its present prosperity, is indissolubly bound up with almost every stage of this Empire's expansion and with every phase of this Empire's life? For the inventive genius of your townsmen more than a century ago is for ever associated with the origin, as well as the later developments, of that natural force which has brought the various portions of this Empire as near to each other as were our native shires and counties in the sixteenth century.

About the same period, within the walls of your ancient University, a solitary thinker pointed out not only to this country, but to the world, the true basis of the wealth of nations, and gave to the commerce of this Empire the policy which it still pursues. And within my own memory the first Atlantic cable was laid by another Glasgow man, one of the greatest scientists that ever lived, the late Lord Kelvin. And of how glorious a record of Empire we are reminded by the heroic name of Sir Colin Campbell, Lord Clyde, and by the achievements of your splendid Scottish regiments on one stricken field after another! Finally, at the present hour, what city is more dependent for its prosperity, for its trade and its industry, upon the prosperity of this Empire as a whole? The ships built in your own docks transport the goods made in your own factories into every sea, and return laden with the products of every clime. I feel, then, gentlemen, that I need make no apology for coming here to-night to address you on the defence of these islands and this Empire; and here also, as at Wolverhampton, I should consider myself false to you as my fellow citizens, and a traitor to this nation, if, at this hour of crisis and urgency, I did not speak to you openly and frankly. What, then, is my conception of the nation's requirements, and what is the reform in our military system which I desire to inaugurate? Gentlemen, I will answer you briefly and straightforwardly.

I desire to inaugurate a reform that in a few years from its

becoming the law of the land will provide for the defence of these islands a Citizen Army, sufficient in numbers and efficiently trained. Such an Army, and such an Army alone, will not only guard these shores from foreign invasion, but secure for us immunity from those panics which by their recurrence threaten to undermine not only our dignity as a nation, but the very foundations of our trade and commerce. For that is the true slavery—to live in fear of other nations through trusting for your defence to the valour or skill of other men. Now there is only one way in which such an Army can be raised, and that is by some form of the Compulsory System. The history of the old Volunteers in all its stages, and the recent total and irremediable breakdown of the new Territorials, have made this evident. But, gentlemen, I go further; I affirm that a compulsory system, affecting every able-bodied man and all classes of this nation alike, is the only system by which such an Army *ought* to be raised.

Gentlemen, I must be plain with you. I have the utmost regard for the voluntary system as a means of raising a small, carefully trained and equipped body of men for service abroad against any enemy and at any time; but as a means for the defence of these islands, the voluntary system, and the false confidence which that system inspires, are sapping the very foundations of the national character, drying up the sources of manly energy, and are a standing menace to the independence of the British nation. And at the present juncture of world-history, by what possible appeal to law, or right, or reason, can any able-bodied man deliberately refuse to acquire the power efficiently to defend himself and his country should that country be invaded? Yes, I dare say, under the evil influence of the voluntary system, every man says to himself that if the day of invasion ever comes he will prove himself willing to serve; and, I dare say, many would take their places in the firing line who to-day would consider themselves aggrieved if they were compelled to enrol in a Citizen Army. But, gentlemen, words are not swords, and good intentions are not deeds; and in the conditions of modern warfare the will to fight is far removed from the power to fight. Preparation is absolutely necessary, and thorough preparation. It is the merest madness to suppose that, when once war is upon us, we shall have six months or six weeks, or even six days, in which to

acquire the discipline necessary to a modern soldier. We must begin now—now, whilst there is yet time; now, before the danger becomes a reality.

Gentlemen, when I consider the momentousness of the issue; when I consider the fates that are in the balance, I confess that, experienced as I am in the defects of human character and the temptations to self-indulgence masking themselves under such venerated names as "liberty" and "individual rights"—I confess that the hesitation of my fellow countrymen astonishes and disquiets me. Everywhere there comes to us the sound of the arming of men—from France, from Germany, from Russia, from Italy, from Austria. Our very Colonies, the distant outworks of this Empire, are, one after another, beginning to recognise the duty and the honour of national training for the defence of their country; and in New Zealand, in Australia, and in United South Africa, a Citizen Army is already arising. But we, we Britons, the warders of this vast Empire's very centre—we Britons, the garrison, as it were, of its inmost fort and citadel, we alone sit in complacent indifference, blind to the significance of the times, insensible to the warnings that come to us alike from friends and foes! What greater scourge can afflict a nation than the scourge of apathy? For if through our remissness or voluntary abstention a disaster should overtake us, it will not be the fortune of these islands alone that will be reversed: the Empire itself will dissolve, and its greatness become a mere memory in the wreckage of time. Such is the tremendous responsibility that by our inaction we Britons take upon ourselves.

Here, therefore, in this ancient city, remarkable at once in commerce and in the arts, I demand your attention whilst I put to you the question: Are you prepared to face that responsibility? Have you thought it all over? I appeal above all to you, the young men of Scotland, whether you are students at this University or apprentices in the factories of this city, or whether, like your great national poet, you walk behind the plough upon the mountain side—to you I appeal. Yes, and as a witness to this appeal I dare to summon up the memory of that poet, that hero-spirit, whose words, whenever he speaks of love of country and of independence, have in them the ring of swords, and who proved by the valour with which he fought his life-long struggle against adversity, with

what splendid devotion he would have fought for his country—I summon up as a witness to my appeal your hero-poet, Robert Burns, and I protest to you my belief that his superb lines are most relevant to this crisis—

> Who, for Scotland's King and Law,
> Freedom's sword will strongly draw,
> Free-man stand, or Free-man fa'
> Let him on wi' me!

I am confident that Burns would have been on my side; and that those lines are not more applicable to the decision and to the alternatives which Bruce placed before his followers at Bannockburn, than they are to the decision and the alternatives that I place before you to-night.

It is useless at this date to speak to me of the Navy, and of the protection which our "Dreadnoughts" will afford. I have the most profound admiration for the gallantry of our seamen, and for the ability of their commanders; and I recognise the service, the immense service, which, under favourable circumstances, our Fleet would render; but in the wars of the future the Navy will have its own varied and peculiar tasks, and those tasks will certainly not permit it to anchor like a wall around these islands! Gentlemen, the dockyards of Glasgow are famous throughout the world; your merchant ships go out into all seas—need I therefore remind you citizens of Glasgow that to guard the trade-routes of Empire, to protect our commerce and our food, and all the time to be prepared to meet the navies of other Powers, imposes a task upon our Fleet complex and intricate beyond anything that was dreamed of in the days of Nelson, of Duncan, or old "Dreadnought" Boscawen. It is useless also at this date to speak to me of our small but admirably disciplined Regular Army. That Army must be prepared at a moment's notice to quit these shores to defend some threatened outpost of Empire, or to take its place side by side with an ally on the Continent of Europe. For, again let me remind you, these islands do not stand alone, isolated and apart; their fate is bound up with the fate of Europe. The independence of the different countries of Europe, indeed, is a prime essential to the independence of Great Britain. And if ever the independence of those countries is threatened, Great Britain must be prepared to place a sufficiently large Army at the

disposal of an ally in defence of that independence. How is such a policy to be realised unless our Expeditionary Force be absolutely mobile, unhampered by the necessity of providing for home defence?

What then remains, or should remain, to guard these islands? I answer: a Citizen Army, and a Citizen Army alone, affords such protection—an Army in which all able-bodied young men of this nation, drawn from all ranks and classes, shall enrol themselves, united by one enthusiasm, uplifted by one great purpose—to ensure that no foreign foe shall ever set foot upon the sacred soil of these islands, or, if he make that venture, that he shall promptly repent his rashness. Here, however, I imagine the Chairman of the local Association inquiring: But what of the Territorials? Are they not sufficient?

Gentlemen, I have so often explained my attitude towards the Territorial Force; I have so often stated my conviction of its total inadequacy; I have so often set forth the careful observations by which I was forced to that conviction, that I have grown almost weary of my own words, and fatigued by the multitude of arguments supporting my own contention. Further, I have so often expressed my admiration for the patriotism and spirited devotion of the individual men and officers who constitute the Territorial Force that I am astonished that even my opponents have not ceased to accuse me of belittling those officers or those men. Nevertheless, I repeat here once more that I have nothing but admiration for that spirit and that patriotism, and I appreciate to the full such skill and such discipline as, despite the wrongness of the system itself, certain brigades of the Territorial Force have acquired; and in that respect I set the Glasgow brigades high amongst the highest. And yet, gentlemen, that skill and that discipline, though good, are not good enough; and as for numbers, all of you who read the newspapers, or take any interest whatever in this question, must be aware how desperate the shortage is, alike in officers and men, notwithstanding every inducement that a partial Government and a partial Cabinet have, during the past seven years, held out to every young man willing to join the Force. The whole scheme now stands before the world condemned—an embarrassment or a rankling regret to ourselves; but to our enemies a subject of rejoicing.

But observe, gentlemen, I am not myself asking for a Citizen

Army that shall consist of highly trained soldiers; trained, for example, as our Regulars are trained. So highly disciplined an Army is not necessary for the purpose I have in view. The requirements of Britain are not the requirements of France or Germany; nor would any man in his senses recommend in this country the creation of such an Army as is necessary to the very existence of certain Continental States. What I do demand is a Citizen Army sufficiently strong in numbers and sufficiently perfect in discipline that, possessing those advantages and superiority in numbers, which Universal Military Training would give, and knowledge of the ground, which a war in these islands should most certainly guarantee, it shall be able not only to hold in check any invading force that is likely to be landed on these shores, but shall be able also to take the offensive against that force, and compel its prompt and unconditional surrender. The possession of this latter power, though it seems to have escaped the reckonings of the advocates of the Voluntary system, is necessary and essential. For an army which cannot take the offensive is, in the long run, a defeated army. Now, how is such an Army to be raised? To create such an Army no more is necessary than that the young men of this country between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one should consent to a continuous training—a training only long enough to ensure efficiency in discipline, drill, and musketry—such training to be obligatory on every rank and class alike, high and low, rich and poor, with no exemptions of any kind. All shall meet in that Army, whether in camp or barrack, as in some great school or university. And, gentlemen, merit and military aptitude, not wealth or social influence, shall determine which man shall be a private, which man an officer. And what means more effective could be devised to combat the apathy which, like a subtle and insidious disease, is gradually infecting this whole nation? And for the individual young men themselves, what more health-giving diversion from the beaten path of trade or profession could be invented than just this opportunity for increasing that moral and muscular development which military training offers? Such, then, is the Territorial or Citizen Army which I desire to see established in these islands.

But, you may inquire, to what uses shall we put that Army? Gentlemen, the policy of Great Britain, whatever it may have been in the past, is now a policy of peace: defence, not defiance,

is our watchword. And defence, and defence only, will be the task imposed on the citizen forces thus raised. In no circumstances shall a single man of that Army be obliged to quit these shores. If he volunteers for service abroad it will be of his own free will. Nor will that Army as a whole ever be required to fire a rifle, except *into the ranks of an enemy actually landed on these shores.* Again, and now I address especially the working men of my audience, it will be an Army which, simply because it is a citizen force, can never be used either to put down strikes or to interfere with any other legitimate combinations formed for the mutual interest of the working men of this country. I state these details once more because of the persistent criticism to which that part of my scheme has been subjected, and the persistent misrepresentations to which it has given rise.

Gentlemen, it is my fixed belief that the campaign which, as I have already said, I began at Bristol four months ago is one of the greatest and most necessary reforms ever placed before the people of this country. And here to-night it is impossible for me not to attempt to strike a balance between the hopes and the fears which, at such a time, assail the human breast. And in attempting to strike that balance, when I reflect upon the progress which this movement has made during the past four months in every grade of society amongst the British public and in the Press, a memory comes over me which turns misgiving into hope and apprehension into confidence. It is the memory of the morning when, accompanied by two of Scotland's most famous regiments, the Seaforths and the Gordons, at the end of a long and arduous march, I saw in the distance the walls and minarets of Kandahar, and knew that the end of a great resolve and a great task was near. Thus, gentlemen, to-night, encouraged in no small degree by those crowded meetings at Norwich, at Manchester, at Bristol, at Wolverhampton, and at Leeds, and encouraged above all by your goodwill and this immense concourse in front of me in this hall, and trusting to the influence, direct and indirect, which you can bring to bear on the politicians alike of this city and of this nation, I seem to see the gleam in the near distance of the weapons and accoutrements of this Army of the future—this Citizen Army, the warder of these islands, and the pledge of the peace and of the continued greatness of this Empire.

ROBERTS, F.M.

THE END OF THE ASQUITH LEGEND

PROFESSIONAL politicians as a general rule make the mistake of imagining that the community is divided into certain hard-and-fast camps respectively labelled "Unionist," "Radical," and "Socialist," and that all controversies are decided by men of preconceived prejudices and fixed opinions, who are accordingly alone worthy of consideration. As a matter of fact there is an immense, if not a preponderating, amount of fluid opinion which moves one way or the other according to circumstances. These are the most competent politicians who know how to enlist this detached body in any cause in which they may be interested. In democracies, where intellectual effort is not over popular, public opinion gravitates towards some personality whenever a personality is available, as we saw in the earlier stages of the fiscal campaign, when the great missionary of Empire dominated his compatriots. Few would be found to deny that had Mr. Chamberlain been able to remain in the fighting line the great constructive policy with which his name will be imperishably associated, would by now be an accomplished fact and the history of the last few years, as of the next few years, would require rewriting.

We are now confronted by another issue, and in the absence of any conspicuous champion it is imperative to enlist from the outset not merely the support, but the whole-hearted sympathy and enthusiasm of all Englishmen and Englishwomen who really and effectively care for the cause of Clean Government, about which, until recent events, there were not two opinions among serious people. Whatever our political prepossessions and partisanship, all were supposed to be agreed that certain things were possible and other things impossible, and that there could be no choice for Ministers who had stepped over the border line

but to seek positions of greater freedom and less responsibility. It was equally acknowledged that in the almost unthinkable event of Ministers failing to discharge a plain duty they would be sharply brought to book by the Prime Minister for the time being, who in the interests of his Party, if he were indifferent to larger national interests, would compel the recalcitrants to do what they should have done without a whisper of constraint. There would have been unanimity on such a subject the other day, but the administration of the callous cynic now at the head of affairs in this unfortunate country has not only lowered the whole tone of our public life, but is visibly relaxing the standards which were assumed, as a matter of course, to regulate the conduct of persons in high places. With a few more years of Asquithism the British Government will in many respects be indistinguishable from Tammany Hall. The energies of statesmen will be divided between Stock Exchange speculations and concealing those operations from the public. *Facilis descensus Averni.*

These pages are not written for the benefit of partisans, and I have very good reason for knowing that strong as has been the attitude and the language of the *National Review* on the Marconi question, it is warmly approved in circles which on nine public questions out of ten hold diametrically opposite opinions to those with which this periodical is identified. This appeal is not to Unionists, but to the general public who are watching the attitude of all parties with increasing impatience and suspicion which has been accentuated by the scarcely veiled efforts of a large section of the Press, Radical, Unionist, and Labour, to say nothing of the Nationalists, who have their own separate axes to grind, to prevent the people from making themselves acquainted with elementary incontestable facts. Englishmen have probably never been great newspaper readers, though they are great newspaper buyers and great newspaper skimmers, who are readily thrown off the scent by bold headlines as conspicuous as they are mendacious. There was a notable instance of this only the other day on the publication of the Report of the independent Expert Committee, which has lately investigated "existing systems of long-distance wireless telegraphy, and in particular as to their capacity for

continuous communication over the distances required by the Imperial chain." We owe the existence of this Committee to the Marconi Select Committee, and full credit is due to Sir Albert Spicer (Chairman of the Select Committee) and his colleagues for their one outstanding act of independence in recommending the appointment of this Expert Committee despite the strenuous, insidious, but happily unavailing, efforts of the Postmaster-General. Mr. Herbert Samuel found himself compelled to eat the leek and the following Committee was appointed: Lord Parker of Waddington (Chairman), Mr. Duddell, F.R.S., Dr. R. T. Glazebrook, F.R.S., Sir Alexander Kennedy, F.R.S., Mr. J. Swinburne, F.R.S., with Mr. E. H. Rayner as Secretary. In view of Mr. Samuel's suspicious efforts to prevent this valuable enquiry there is a certain grim humour in its being officially described as "appointed by the Postmaster-General," just as it is somewhat scandalous of certain newspapers to represent its Report as a victory for the Post Office and a vindication of the Marconi Agreement of March 7, 1912, or July 19, 1912, according as you take the Isaacs view that all was over except the shouting in March, and that consequently Ministers were free to speculate in April—or the Samuel view that such serious negotiations continued from March onwards until July as to make it impossible for a self-respecting Postmaster-General to take the House of Commons and the country into his confidence as to the terms of the contract.

It is understood that nowadays Mr. Asquith's Government stands or falls by both these mutually irreconcilable views. In order to justify the April gamble everything that need be was "announced" in the beginning of March last year and fastidious Ministers waited "six weeks" after the "announcement," and then in their anxiety to preserve their characters as Cæsar's wives they made an "investment" in *a* Marconi Company scarcely on bowing terms with *the* Marconi Company. How could the strictest purist question such a transaction? Alternatively, should you suggest that if *the* Marconi Company was in a position to "announce" the Agreement of March 7 in a circular to its shareholders, then surely the other contracting party, namely, the British Post Office, might at the same date have issued its version, you are met by the Samuel assumption that such prolonged and complicated negotiations followed "the

formal acceptance of the tender" that only a blithering idiot could possibly suggest that the House of Commons should have been placed in possession of the facts one hour before the completion of the contract on July 19. You may pay your money but you can't take your choice. The March theory is essential in order to save the gamblers; the July theory is vital to save the Post Office. As many Ministers are sorely in need of salvation just now we must not complain of the multiplicity of theories. Let us stick to the facts, which have been remarkably illuminating throughout "The Great Marconi Mystery." In fact we should be nowhere without them. Why did Mr. Samuel offer vehement opposition to the appointment of an independent Expert Committee in his impassioned speech before the Marconi Select Committee on January 13, 1913?

The Postmaster-General began by explaining in his highest and mightiest Front Bench manner that he had had the advantage of being able "to consult the officials of the Departments concerned—the Admiralty, the War Office, the Treasury, the Colonial Office, and my own Department, and the High Commissioner of South Africa—and it (acquaintance with the contents of the Draft Interim Report proposing that an independent Expert Committee should investigate different wireless systems) has also given me the opportunity of ascertaining the views of some of my colleagues who are also directly affected." That ought to have sufficed, all the more as the majority of the Select Committee, at any rate, were not then aware of Ministerial speculations in Marconi shares—American. They were condescendingly told that the Government favoured an immediate selection of sites, as suggested in their Interim Report, and "will be most happy to act upon" it. But our Marconi-mad Postmaster-General let it be seen that he could not conceive of any selection of sites without the approval of the Marconi Company.

After a good deal more verbiage, the Postmaster-General produced a communication from the "Admiralty" which is perhaps worth reproducing:

With reference to the verbal enquiry of the Postmaster-General, I am commanded by My Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to state that they adhere to the view formerly expressed in Admiralty letter of May 5, 1911, and since confirmed by Admiralty

representatives in the various discussions which have taken place, that it is not desirable for the Admiralty to undertake the work of erecting or of working the Imperial Wireless chain. So far from modifying this opinion My Lords are still more reluctant than formerly to undertake the work, and in fact consider themselves now not in a position to do so at all.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

O. MURRAY.

Let me hasten to add that the writer of this letter is neither the Master of Elibank nor anybody connected with him, but a distinguished official, the Assistant Secretary of the Admiralty. Mr. Samuel added on behalf of his own Department "that the Post Office has neither the staff nor the experience which would entitle it to consider itself qualified to undertake the actual erection of these stations and the direct conduct of so large an enterprise as this." The modesty of the Post Office concerning its own incapacity *re* wireless telegraphy is only surpassed by its colossal conceit in every other department of the work it so inefficiently performs, of which perhaps the victims of its telephones are the principal sufferers. Mr. Samuel proceeded to try and make the flesh of the Committee creep by emphasising the perils of the appointment of an independent Expert Committee. Such a body might be divided! It might waste time! Inventors would actually wish to come forward and demonstrate their superiority over other inventors! Among other gems which the Postmaster let drop was the following: "I do not think that the State in a matter of this sort should speculate if there is any other course open to it. That has been my view from the beginning." In other words there was nothing for it but to ratify the Marconi Agreement of March 7 or contract of July 19. At all costs this Expert Committee must be stopped, and as a drowning man clutches at a straw Mr. Herbert Samuel suggested that the Select Committee could make up its mind "without hearing any elaborate technical evidence or even after correspondence, or, as I say, if they prefer it, the Government Departments could make the enquiry. Then if tests are desired, such tests could be made by the Government by its own officers, and possibly it might have some outside assistance from gentlemen whose names, if it were desired, could be submitted to this Committee." Doubtless a better plan would have been to

appoint a Special Committee to report within a week consisting of the Postmaster-General, the Attorney-General, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the ex-Master of Elibank, the Managing Director of the Marconi Company, the Chairman and a few other independent persons. As Mr. Samuel artlessly observed: "Those tests could as well be made really without the Technical Committee as with it." No doubt they could—in fact much better from the official point of view, but even in those unenlightened days this was too much for the Marconi Committee. By this time the witness perhaps realised that he had gone too far, so he fell back on patriotism. "Would it be in the interests of the State that the contracts for these stations, which are being erected primarily for strategical reasons, should be placed in the hands of any foreign company *which was in the closest touch with a foreign Government and which had equipped, let us say, the Navy of that foreign Government.*" (My italics.) I speak subject to correction, as I do not pretend to know all the ramifications of all the wireless companies, but is not this precisely the position of the Marconi Company (in whose contract be it observed strategy is not put in the foreground), and has not that Company equipped one of the Navies of the Triple Alliance, which a recent Admiralty Memorandum shows should be regarded for practical purposes as an arm of German sea power? Mr. Samuel was pulled up when he began launching into the usual official disparagement of competitive systems, and when at last he saw the game was up, he insidiously suggested—and the suggestion should be borne in mind—"If the evidence before the Committee leads them to think that the Contract needs any alteration . . . well and good." No less interesting in the light of subsequent developments was the piteous peroration with which the Postmaster-General concluded his appeal to the Select Marconi Committee:

I foresee the greatest possible difficulty in selecting the individuals to form this Committee if it is to be independent both of the Government and all the various wireless systems, and is at the same time to consist of men who are really experts in wireless telegraphy, whose opinion would carry the greatest authority. I do not know whether the Committee have in their mind any particular names, but if so I shall be very glad indeed to consider them, *should the Committee propose to go on with this proposition* [my italics], but for my part, after consulting with others, I can only say that the selection of such a Committee would be a task of the most formidable magnitude.

Mr. Herbert Samuel is, as we know from the Coalition Press, regarded as one of the most efficient, if not actually the most efficient, administrator in the Government, and only the other day the outrage was contemplated of appointing him War Minister. All I can say from a very careful study of Mr. Samuel's performances over the Marconi business, is, if he be the most efficient member of the Cabinet, what must the rest of Mr. Asquith's colleagues be, because there is scarcely a single blunder he has abstained from making from first to last in this melancholy affair. The Select Committee refused to be bluffed and recommended that "the Government appoint a Scientific Committee as indicated above." Upon which Mr. Herbert Samuel had the effrontery to inform the House of Commons: "These recommendations, in their present form, substantially meet the representations which were made to the Committee on behalf of the Government, and the Government will be glad to give immediate effect to them." And actually to-day credit is being claimed for the Postmaster-General for the Report of Lord Parker's Committee.

Charitable persons like myself could only surmise that the Postmaster-General realised that his Marconi policy could not withstand independent scientific investigation, and despite the brazen headlines of Coalition organs I agree with Sir Henry Norman, who be it remembered is not a vicious Tory, but an enlightened Radical, that the Samuel-Isaacs Agreement will not survive the report of Lord Parker and his colleagues who incline to the policy propounded by Sir Henry Norman and Sir George Croydon Marks (another Radical Member of Parliament), and against the policy upon which Mr. Herbert Samuel has staked his battered, shattered reputation. If the reader has any doubt as to the purport of the Parker Report—which, though written in cautious judicial language suitable to the occasion, leaves little room for doubt as to the opinion of the first independent body of experts who have been allowed to examine the wireless problem—he should consult the original document and ignore disingenuous headlines.

I only wish it were possible to reproduce it *in extenso* so that the reader might appreciate the misrepresentations of interested parties picking out a single sentence or fragment

of a sentence. After pointing out what is after all the key to the problem, "we desire to lay stress on the fact that the Government is not fettered by considerations arising out of patent rights, but can use any patent on fair terms under Section 29 of the Patents and Designs Act, 1907," Lord Parker and his colleagues briefly review various wireless systems at work, reporting "according to our investigation the Marconi system is at present the only system of which it can be said with any certainty that it is capable of fulfilling the requirements of the Imperial chain." Here the Coalition Press and the Marconi Press stop short, suppressing the rest of the sentence:

but this must not be taken to imply that, in our opinion, the Marconi Company must necessarily be employed as contractors for all the work required for the Imperial chain. Indeed, in some respects it might, we think, be better for the Government themselves to undertake the construction and equipment of the necessary stations, acting for that purpose under the best technical and scientific advice which can be obtained, and employing the most suitable contractors for the various portions of the work or plant. On the other hand, it may be said, and is no doubt the fact, that at the present moment the Marconi Company alone has had practical experience of the sort of long-distance work required, including experience in putting down stations, in organising the traffic and staff, and in coping with the difficulties that arise in a new industry, and the value of such experience and organisation may well outweigh other considerations, if rapid installation and immediate and trustworthy communication be desired.

Such an opinion from such a quarter is well worth considering, though one cannot help feeling in the light of all that has happened, that in spite of practical results attained by the Marconi Company, the less the British Government has to do with it the better, as even were its acknowledged achievements greater than is claimed, to many of us there appear to be other features which should make us prefer inferior arrangements to any form of "partnership" with Mr. Godfrey Isaacs and his Company. We hold the opinion which has been so ably advocated by Sir Henry Norman and others that it is undesirable to be tied up with this system or with that system, as we should retain our independence and select the best of every system. While fully recognising the merits of the Marconi patents, Lord Parker and his colleagues would appear to share this view, and we interpret their report as a polite but pointed

disapproval of the official wireless policy. They point out *inter alia* that

> wireless telegraphy is in a condition of rapid development. . . . The directive aerial used in the Marconi system has the advantage of not requiring very great height and of giving preference in the desired direction. Its use in connection with the separate receiving station comparatively close to the transmitting aerial makes duplex working practicable. We see no reason why this form of aerial should not be capable of use with any form of high-frequency generator. Moreover, the development of the aerial may facilitate the use of still longer waves for long-distance work, and this may profoundly affect the problem of the high-frequency generator, by rendering possible the employment of simple alternators for the production of the frequency required, high though it must still be. Receiving plant may take many forms. Thus the first receiver may be a crystal contact or some discharge valve on the lines of the Fleming valve, and this may work any one of various kinds of relay; and the record may be made by a Morse inker, by photography, by a phonograph, by simple telephone or otherwise. There is a wide field here for experiment and development.

The Expert Committee add:

> Having regard to these facts it is, in our opinion, undesirable that in constructing and equipping the stations of the Imperial chain the Post Office should be pledged to the continued use of any apparatus now used in any so-called system, or be subject to any penalty by way of continued royalties or otherwise for the disuse of any apparatus which may be installed in the first instance. It is, we consider, imperative that in any contract which may be entered into the Post Office should reserve complete liberty of action in this respect. Further, the stations should be constructed and equipped with a view to the possible and probably rapid development of the art, and we think it would be wise that at any rate two of the stations should be used at once not only for commercial purposes, but as experimental stations in which the various high-frequency generators hereinbefore referred to, and also any suggested improvement in any part of the apparatus, should as far as possible be thoroughly tested. This would involve the employment of a highly trained staff with an engineer of special knowledge and of high standing at their head, but the information thus obtained would be invaluable for the construction and equipment or the improvement in the design of the stations.
>
> Even when all the stations are constructed, equipped and in working order, we do not think it would be wise to cease using some of the stations for experimental purposes. We have already referred to the possibility that the existence of patents may fetter the normal development of an industry. A Government monopoly may stop its growth altogether, and is almost sure to do so unless the Government department which works the industry is ready to welcome and test any new invention or improvement, to adopt and use it if the test be satisfactory, and to pay for it on fair terms if it be adopted. For the purpose of testing, examining and, if necessary, further developing any new invention or suggested improvement in wireless telegraphy, a trained staff with an engineer of special knowledge and standing at its head will be necessary. Under the guidance of such a staff and engineer we see no reason why the Post Office wireless stations should not be ultimately equipped with apparatus far more efficient than that

now used in any so-called system, more especially as the Post Office will be able to combine, in spite of existing patent rights, apparatus or devices which, because of the existence of such rights, cannot now be combined by any one else.

Last, but by no means least, Lord Parker and his colleagues make the suggestive observation: "We desire to add that the provisions of the Agreement now the subject of enquiry by a Select Committee of the House of Commons are not, in our opinion, within the terms of our reference; *but nothing we have said in this Report must be taken as expressing our approval of such provisions.*" (My italics.)

Such is the triumph of the Post Office.

Although little is expected from the present House of Commons the Coalition can scarcely, in the face of such a Report, ratify the preposterous Agreement of March 7, 1912, or contract of July 19, 1912, to salve the *amour propre* of one of the many Jonahs of the present Government and part author of one of the worst moral catastrophes in British politics, because but for his childish secretiveness there would not have been that calamitous concealment so invaluable to market manipulators. We can now appreciate the additional stimulus to Mr. Samuel's ardour in opposing the appointment of the Parker Committee, which obviously involved the doom of his *chef d'œuvre* besides securing the prolongation of the sittings of the Select Committee so perilous to the Government. Once again the handful of critics who, *ab initio*, opposed the unconsidered ratification of the Marconi Agreement (which Mr. Samuel was so desperately anxious to hustle through the House last August) as *per se* a bad agreement because it would tie the Government up with one particular Company and prejudice the development of wireless telegraphy in the British Empire—has been abundantly vindicated. Let us be grateful to those Dominion Governments which refused to be cajoled into the Post Office trap at the beginning of last year, in refreshing contrast to the feebleness of the South African Government in saying ditto to St. Martins-le-Grand. Mr. Samuel occupies almost as pitiable a plight at the present moment as his Stock Exchange colleagues, to whom wireless telegraphy's principal attraction was its unrivalled opportunities for "getting in on the ground floor" or the first floor, or whatever may have been the precise story on which

Sir Rufus Isaacs and Co. effected what should have been a highly profitable lodgment.

Amidst more sensational aspects of the Marconi mystery, let us not lose sight of the fact that the Marconi Agreement stands self-condemned. So far as I know not a single man with a soul to call his own has a good word to say for it. Even when it was discussed in the House of Commons on that fatal Friday in October, when there was no time for Mr. Lloyd George to disclose the truth then burning in his bosom, there were among private members none so poor—save a solitary Nationalist—to do reverence to the Marconi policy of the Postmaster-General, which is now not only dead but damned.

Let us return to our muttons. No one can accuse the Unionist Party of seeking to make indecent capital out of the folly, the misfortunes and the scandals which have become the chief stock-in-trade of latter-day Radicalism since the great historic Party fell under the auspices of barristers—briefed and briefless. On the contrary, from the outset, the Leader of the Opposition afforded the Prime Minister a precious opportunity of doing the right thing at the right time and of clearing his Cabinet in the eyes of the country. The episode is worth recalling. People were amazed at the time at Mr. Asquith's curt rejection of Mr. Bonar Law's opening, though his conduct has become plain in the interval. Indeed throughout the Marconi Mystery it will invariably be found that further and better particulars involve deeper and deeper discredit to the Asquith Government. Men are naturally asking themselves whether we are anywhere near the end of the chapter of Ministerial revelations. The painful exhibition which the Prime Minister invariably makes of himself whenever information is sought concerning possible speculations of his colleagues may be attributable to guilty knowledge of much worse transactions than any that have yet fluked into daylight. Mr. Asquith has no one to thank but himself at the impression encouraged by his demeanour, which has been accentuated by the calculated grotesqueness of Mr. Churchill before the Marconi Committee, when he managed at once to give a devilish back-hander to his Marconi colleagues, while, unlike them, he escaped cross-examination. On public grounds this is regrettable because in every case cross-examination—however tenderly conducted—

has elicited something. We should be appreciably the poorer if the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Attorney-General, and the Postmaster-General had bluffed the Committee like the First Lord of the Admiralty. The latter's view on the conduct of the former would in any case have been interesting. We are admittedly the worse off through the absence and silence of the once mighty Master of Elibank, whose search for oil is alleged to have drawn him fourteen days' of hard mule riding from the nearest wireless telegraphy office. We live in hopes of one day hearing from the wanderer, and as we know his luckless friend and associate at the Exchequer is unable to close his historic transaction in American Marconis until the mule-born Master says or sends the word. We hear of the Master's securing oil concessions for the proud house of Pearson on whose behalf he travels, but so far as we know " mum " is the word concerning Marconis. The Master probably shared the view set forth so forcibly in the Coalition Press up to the moment of the libel action against *Le Matin*, that so incapable were Ministers ot gambling or " investing " in Marconi shares that to mention the widespread rumours connecting their names with such transactions was conclusive evidence of a diseased and depraved imagination. The resources of vituperation were beggared in attempting to describe " the ethics of the ashpit " animating these wicked scandalmongers who averred that probability pointed to the fact that some Ministers tempted with Marconi shares available on favourable terms through inside knowledge—had fallen. When confession could no longer be safely delayed, presumably through fear of exposure, and it was casually mentioned in the *Matin* action *apropos de bottes* that the Attorney-General and two of his colleagues, who would sooner have been burnt alive than touch a share in the Parent Marconi Company negotiating with the British Government, had between them held 10,000 shares in April 1912 (during the negotiations) in one of its " associated " companies, which came as a complete surprise to the country for the simple reason that the public had been given to understand by Ministers themselves, with the acquiescence of the Prime Minister, that there had been no Ministerial speculations in Marconi shares—old-fashioned people momentarily deluded themselves into believing that the Attorney-

General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer and any other colleagues involved in this affair would not allow a day to pass without insisting on relieving the Government of their presence. Alternatively it was assumed in the same quarters that should Sir Rufus Isaacs and Mr. Lloyd George prove too obtuse to appreciate the delicacies of the situation, a Prime Minister, habitually described in the newspapers as "'a great parliamentarian" with a proper reverence for those traditions which are supposed to mark off the Mother of Parliaments from less august assemblies, would hasten to recall his erring colleagues to some sense of the fitness of things and convince them that their room would be more welcome to the Cabinet than their company.

The Leader of the Opposition, as joint custodian of the honour of the House of Commons with the head of the Government, rightly afforded Mr. Asquith an opportunity of saying the word in season and of doing the right thing, and by this timely action Mr. Bonar Law has absolved the Unionist Party from any disagreeable consequences that may, and indeed must, ensue during the painful struggle forced upon us by our Ministry of mules. On the day following the disclosures in the *Matin* case, during which, while denying that the matter bore any relevance to the libel the Attorney-General had deemed it prudent to begin lifting the American veil, Mr. Bonar Law thus addressed Mr. Asquith (March 20): "I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question of which I have given him private notice, namely, when he proposes to make a statement with reference to the evidence given in the action against *Le Matin?*" To this the Prime Minister replied: "I only received the right hon. gentleman's notice since I came into the House. *It had not occurred to me it was my duty to make any statement in this matter* [my italics]. Of course, I shall be very glad to answer any enquiries the right hon. gentleman or any of his friends may wish to put." Mr. Bonar Law observed: "I had hoped that the right hon. gentleman would have taken a different view, and that he will even now reconsider it; and in order to enable him to do so I shall put the question again later." Simpletons who invariably outnumber the sophisticated were astounded at Mr. Asquith's attitude, though the suspicious who are increasing in number suspected that worse lay behind,

as indeed proved to be the case and as indeed has always proved to be the case throughout this sinister and sordid business.

In any other country—especially in countries which our superior persons are pleased to call "corrupt"—the *Matin* revelations would have been instantaneously followed by a drastic reconstruction of the Cabinet, even if the latter had not completely collapsed as a result of its home-made humiliation. An alert and determined public opinion, educated by a watchful and vigorous Press, would have made the continuance in office of Marconi Ministers impossible, and had their colleagues elected to identify themselves with the culprits there would have been a prompt and salutary change of Government. No one familiar with French affairs doubts for a moment but that the Asquith Cabinet would have gone the way of the Caillaux Cabinet had the sphere of its operations occurred across the channel. In Germany the Emperor would have sent Marconi Ministers abruptly about their business. In the United States any President hesitating to act in a similar contingency would have been lost. In every case the Pecksniffs of the British Press would have turned up the whites of their eyes, would have preached the usual unctuous sermons on our moral superiority over benighted foreigners, while Cobdenites would not have been slow to point out that such episodes were the inevitable incidents of Protection. Professional politicians would have drawn the agreeable inference that once more the policy of under-paying eminent public servants stood condemned; "under our blessed dispensation the salaries of Ministers may seem high running as they do up to £12,000 a year, but it is a sound investment, for it places our public men beyond Stock Exchange temptations. Who could imagine a British Attorney-General or a British Chancellor of the Exchequer gambling in Marconi shares like —— and —— in France, Germany, or the United States," as the case may be? British prestige has sustained many shocks in recent years, but it is a matter of common knowledge corroborated by everybody in touch with foreign opinion that nothing has done us more harm than recent revelations, not merely on account of the things said, unsaid, and done, but even more because the Cabinet of May 20, 1912, remains identical with the Cabinet of March 20, 1913—the morrow of the *Matin* case—when the

Leader of the Opposition invited the Prime Minister to put himself right with public opinion.

Much contempt was poured in this country on the Radical bloc which governed France for some years, but at any rate it was a public bloc with public objects. It was not a Marconi bloc in which public objects are sacrificed to private interests, such as afflicts England at the moment, though one may hope only for the moment. If the Opposition does its duty in educating the country and declines to be paralysed by prominent members of the great Trade Union of the law, we may anticipate a restoration of the canons of clean Government such as prevailed so late as the régime of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. The reader will not accuse us of any prepossession in favour of the late Premier, who pandered to the lowest *political* instincts of his Party, when we say that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman would never have plumbed the depths of degradation in which Mr. Asquith moves and lives and has his being.

We now know the reason that Mr. Asquith was unable to adopt a becoming attitude towards his Marconi colleagues. In the first place he is *particeps criminis*, by which I do not mean to say that he has personally speculated in Marconi shares, nor have I heard his name mentioned in this connection. I am not aware that he has ever made any statement on the subject, and as we have learnt from lesser masters of quibble, no statement made from the Treasury Bench, where Ministers do not speak on oath, is worth the breath with which it is spoken. Ministerial utterances are framed to mislead. Mr. Asquith has, however, made one confession, which, though not on oath, may be believed, because it discredits him. The *Matin* revelations prompted simple folk to express sympathy with an injured Prime Minister who had been "let in" by his colleagues, as it was not conceivable that he, "who with all his faults is a great Member of Parliament inspired by a profound attachment to the loftiest parliamentary traditions," could have been privy to his colleagues' Stock Exchange operation, or he would never have permitted the speeches made during the Marconi Debate last October, which not only misled the country—a comparatively venial offence among Party mandarins—but encouraged the Radical Party and the Radical Press to "go

nap" on the impossibility of any Ministers participating in any speculations in any Marconi shares. Such a charge would have been pronounced a sin against the Holy Ghost, and if in criticising the rhetoric of October any of us had incidentally suggested that Mr. Asquith was capable of sitting still during this magnificent demonstration of the *suppressio veri et suggestio falsi*, being probably aware that his colleagues had speculated in one or other Marconi Company, all parliamentary business would have been swiftly swept aside in order that the *auto-da-fé* might become part of the law of the land as the only adequate means of coping with such a gross outrage. Yet such a statement, monstrous as it would have seemed to the Coalition, would have been strictly true. Mr. Asquith, as the head of the Government, was as responsible for the declarations made by Ministers as the actual spokesmen. He is therefore accountable to Parliament for the following utterances, made on October 11, 1912.

The Postmaster-General:

Neither I myself nor any of my colleagues have at any time held one shilling's worth of shares in this Company, directly or indirectly, or have derived one penny profit from the fluctuations in their prices. It seems shameful that political feeling can carry so far, that lying tongues can be found to speak and ears found to listen to such wicked and utterly baseless slanders such as these. This Committee (*i.e.*, the Marconi Committee) which will be appointed, will enquire into every aspect of this question, and members of the Government will be most ready to appear before it. Every member of the House may have full confidence that while every part of this transaction will come under the searchlight of examination, it will be shown that there is no uncleanliness in any quarter.

The Attorney-General:

Let me go to the next charge, which is, I think, a worse charge. It is that some member of the Government not named, but hinted at—some member or members of the Cabinet—knowing that these negotiations were taking place, knowing that there was a contract in contemplation, and thinking the shares would go up when the announcement of the contract came to be made—the price of the shares being then 14*s*. or 15*s*. and eventually rose to £9 after the announcement of the contract was made—thereupon, and in consequence of the information which some member of the Government had got, bought shares in this Company at a low price, in order to sell them at the higher price when the contract was announced. I desire to say frankly, on behalf of myself, that that is absolutely untrue. Never from the beginning, when the shares were 14*s*. or £9, have I had one single transaction with the shares of that Company. I am not only speaking for myself, but I am also speaking on behalf, I know, of both my right hon. friend the Postmaster-General, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, in some way or other, in some of the articles, have been brought into this matter.

Mr. Lloyd George:

The hon. member said something about the Government, and he has talked about "rumours." I want to know what these rumours are. If the hon. gentleman has any charge to make against the Government as a whole or against individual members of it, I think it ought to be stated openly. The reason why the Government wanted a frank discussion before going to Committee was because we wanted to bring here these rumours, these sinister rumours, that have been passed from one foul lip to another behind the backs of the House. . . . I came here this afternoon because I had heard what was said outside. I have waited carefully, and not a single member on the other side of the House, or anybody else who has taken part in this Debate, has ever hinted at anything. The only member who has hinted completely dissociated himself from the rumours. The hon. member (Mr. Lansbury) is the first one who has said so: I demand that his charge shall be formulated.

The reader may be disposed to reply—the Radical reader who has been studiously kept in the dark will certainly insist—that as these were not Mr. Asquith's declarations it is unfair to saddle him with them, although he is titular head of the Government and nominally responsible for what his colleagues say.

"You are surely not going to suggest that Mr. Asquith was aware of the Attorney-General's and the Chancellor of the Exchequer's operations in American Marconis of April 17, 1912, when he acquiesced in these speeches of October 11, 1912? You are not going to suggest that Mr. Asquith was aware of this gamble when the Postmaster-General made his omnibus disclaimer on behalf of all his colleagues, universally interpreted at the time as covering all Marconi Companies? Nor can you suggest that Mr. Herbert Samuel was aware of the American venture. Such suggestions could only proceed from political malignity. Mr. Asquith is above such conduct."

So he should be, but unfortunately these are not my suggestions. They are his own admissions, and the admissions of Mr. Samuel, both of whom have declared that they were informed last summer, weeks and months before the Marconi Debate, of the first American transaction by the Attorney-General, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Chief Whip of the Party. Sceptical credulous partisans who invariably believe what they want to believe and reject the inconvenient would refuse to credit this assertion without the Prime Minister's word for it. Our case-hardened Coalition are growing accustomed to almost

anything, but even they were startled when, a few days after the *Matin* case, on March 26, in reply to a question, Mr. Asquith coolly told the House of Commons: "I was informed by the Master of Elibank at the end of July or the beginning of August (1912) that he and the Attorney-General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had purchased shares in an American Marconi Company." "An" is good. Mr. Asquith added: "At a later date in August the Attorney-General repeated the statement to me, and I believe added that they had sold some of their shares, but retained the bulk of them. Both assured me that the purchase was made *after the publication of the contract* [my italics] between the Post Office and the English Marconi Company, and that the American Company had no interest direct or indirect in that contract." Here, again, is another gem of the first water. Mr. Asquith is a lawyer and an expert in legal jargon, and for him to describe the April gambling as "after the publication of the contract" would be "the limit" if we could ever get near the limit in this affair.

In any case he is proved, out of his own mouth, to have been equally guilty with the Marconi section of the Cabinet who made those disastrous speeches last October, misleading Parliament on matters of fact concerning the "personal honour" of Ministers who profess to be furious at the bare suggestion that they might conceivably have speculated in the shares of the parent Company whilst simultaneously proclaiming that the famous American investment was strictly in accordance with the canons of delicacy and discretion laid down by acknowledged experts on dignity and deportment, such as Mr. Lloyd George—when in Opposition. Mr. Asquith's reply to Mr. Bonar Law on Ministerial revelations in the *Matin* case on March 20 becomes as clear as the noonday sun. He was not in a position to take any action, or to suggest any action. He had parted with his independence from the moment he acquiesced in the deception of October. It would be ludicrous for him to-day, simply because his colleagues have been found out, to call upon them to resign after condoning their conduct last summer and tolerating their speeches last autumn.

On this subject there is some of that documentary evidence which is usually lacking at critical moments of the Marconi

mystery. But even here the tale is incomplete. The letter written by Sir Rufus Isaacs to the Prime Minister last August consulting him as to the propriety of taking proceedings against the *Eye Witness* (now the *New Witness*) has been unluckily "mislaid." The Prime Minister's reply was however produced before the Select Committee, together with a letter from the Postmaster-General on the same subject not hitherto published in the *National Review*. It derives added importance from the impending prosecution of Mr. Cecil Chesterton, the Editor of the *New Witness*, for libelling Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, and as the trial has been definitely fixed for May 27—before the publication of these pages—I presume it is safe to reproduce Mr. Samuel's letter without any risk of committing contempt of Court. At the preliminary proceedings against Mr. Chesterton it was understood to be stated by Mr. Godfrey Isaacs' counsel, Mr. Muir, that no less a person than Mr. Herbert Samuel was a party to the prosecution, and a curious world eagerly anticipated this further development of the intimacy between the British Post Office and the Marconi Company. It was consequently a severe disappointment when Mr. Samuel informed the Select Committee that Mr. Muir was mistaken as he was not a party to the case. So Mr. Godfrey Isaacs is playing a lone hand, and I much regret being obliged to go to press without the advantage of further light that might conceivably be thrown on the Great Marconi Mystery by what should be an instructive case however it may terminate. Every single incident throughout this affair has hitherto brought fresh and valuable information, and it will be a cruel disappointment if the Chesterton case fails to contribute its quota of light.

Mr. Herbert Samuel's letter to Sir Rufus Isaacs, which be it remembered was written after the former had learnt from his bolder colleagues of their American investment was, given in evidence by the Postmaster-General:

Saltburn: *August* 8, 1912.

DEAR RUFUS,—As I was leaving King's Cross this morning I saw on the bookstall a copy of to-day's number of Belloc's paper the *Eye Witness*, with an article headed "The Marconi Scandal." I found it to be a gross and unrestrained libel on you and myself. I had just time before the train started to address an envelope to you at the House of Commons and to put the article into it with a scribbled note. I have since obtained your address by telegraph, and this letter enclosing another copy of the

paper will probably reach you before the first. One's natural inclination is, of course, at once to have application made for a writ, and I am not at all sure that that is not the right course. There can be no possible doubt as to the result of an action. It is hardly necessary for me to say that during the long negotiations that preceded the conclusion of the contract there was no action of mine that I would wish withdrawn from any measure of publicity, whether in the Courts or in Parliament. The circumstances that deter me from at once coming to the conclusion that proceedings ought to be taken are the obvious ones: first, that this contemptible rag has a very small circulation; its pages are always full of personal abuse; its articles cannot influence any opinion which is worth having, and an action would give an immense publicity to the libel . . .* And, thirdly, one does not wish to soil one's hands with the thing. As there will in all probability be a Select Committee of the House of Commons in the autumn, to enquire into the wisdom of the contract, the report of that Committee will supply a sufficient answer. On the other hand it is a grave thing when Ministers are directly accused of corrupt action by a newspaper, no matter how obscure and scurrilous, for them to do nothing. With your unrivalled experience of the Law you are better able than I to judge what is best to do, and I will very gladly join you in proceedings if you think it is advisable, or do nothing, if you consider that the better course. If you are of opinion that a writ should be issued and will wire to me to that effect, I will go to town and see a solicitor and start the proceedings on behalf of both of us if you wish. But in that event I should be glad if you would nominate the solicitor, as my own solicitor is my brother, and I think in a case like this it would be better to have some one else. If you are in some doubt as to the proper course, you might think it well to consult the Prime Minister, and in that case I should be glad if you would send on this letter to him.

Students of the Marconi Mystery will note with interest that even after the House rose on August 7, and in spite of Mr. Samuel's failure to bluff Major Archer Shee into withdrawing opposition to the Marconi Agreement, the appointment of a Select Committee, although promised by the Premier, was not regarded among his colleagues as a certainty, for the Postmaster-General informs the Attorney-General: "As there will *in all probability* [my italics] be a Select Committee of the House of Commons in the autumn, &c." There was evidently still a chance of evading enquiry and of letting the dead past bury its dead which gives us a measure of the value of the autumnal agitation against the Marconi policy of the Post Office.

The covering letter in which Sir Rufus Isaacs forwarded

* In reading this letter to the Marconi Select Committee, Mr. Samuel preferred to omit "one sentence in it which is not strictly relevant, and which I would rather not read, but I will hand it to the Committee, and I will mark it for them to see, and I think they will understand the reason why I do not wish to read it. It does not cast any reflection upon anybody in any way."

Mr. Samuel's letter to the Prime Minister has been, as I have said, mislaid, though one hopes it may turn up. Mr. Asquith who, be it also remembered, was aware at the time of the first American investment, though he was not informed of the subsequent joint and independent "flutter" of Mr. Lloyd George and the Master of Elibank on May 22, which he only learnt last December or January, wrote as follows:

August 15, 1912.

MY DEAR RUFUS,—I return the enclosed (copy of *Eye Witness* of August 7). I have carefully read this scurrilous rubbish, and I am clearly of opinion that you should take no notice of it. Samuel gives some excellent reasons in his letter. I suspect that the *Eye Witness* has a very meagre circulation. I notice only one page of advertisements, and that occupied entirely by Belloc's publishers. A prosecution would secure notoriety and might bring in subscribers.

Then follows an irrelevant reference to one of his colleague's love of self-advertisement, and the letter ends: "Yours always, H. H. Asquith."

With our present fuller knowledge of the facts Mr. Asquith's desire to keep his colleagues out of the law courts where evidence is given on oath and extremely awkward questions may be asked, was prudent. No public man is called upon to take note of every scurrilous paragraph of which he may be the object, all the more as some malicious libellers might profit by sensational libel actions, though libel actions are the last experiences sought by responsible editors or proprietors. One might however innocently have imagined that it would have been worth while to nip rumours concerning Ministerial Marconi speculations in the bud the moment they obtained printed currency, even at the risk of increasing the subscribers or advertisers of the *Eye Witness*. But one can now appreciate the danger of such an experiment for the simple reason that the rumours, which were not confined to one Marconi Company as is now conveniently alleged by the Coalition, were well founded, and consequently plaintiffs would have entered the witness box at their peril, as one of them might have been asked by counsel for the defence: "Then Sir Rufus Isaacs I may take it that you have never at any time held any share in any Marconi Company?" Had the witness refused to answer this question or had his counsel successfully objected to its being put, or, alternatively, had it

been answered, the Asquith Government would have found themselves in very much the same plight as they were placed when, for unascertainable reasons, they suddenly resolved to take action against *Le Matin* last February.

Be it remembered that in the autumn even the Coalition Press had not yet begun to draw those incredible distinctions between the various "associated" Marconi Companies which made investment in the parent an unspeakable act of corruption, and an investment in any of the off-spring commendable to the strictest purist. So one may infer that it was not merely the lack of advertisements or the fear of multiplying subscribers to the *Eye Witness* which convinced the Prime Minister of the folly of the proposed proceedings, but the dread of possible revelations and the knowledge that Mr. Asquith himself was hopelessly compromised because he was already aware of the great American gamble. With other Ministerial Micawbers he could only hope—and he had good reason to hope because he was in a position to influence the course of events—that something might turn up to prevent truth from reaching the public.

Our advanced Radical contemporary, the *Nation*, enquires (May 10, 1913): "Would it not have been proper for him (Sir Rufus Isaacs) to free Mr. Asquith's hands by offering his resignation last autumn?" But Mr. Asquith has never indicated the faintest inclination to have his hands "free" of Marconi colleagues. He could have "freed" them at any moment had he chosen to do so or had he been in a position to do so, which is somewhat different. As matters stand we know something about Ministerial American Marconi investments, but there were several other Marconi Companies with their boomlets and their temptations, and no man can guess how far Marconitis may have spread through the party of Progress. *Ex hypothesi* Mr. Asquith could have requested victims of the disease to resign had he thought fit to do so when he was first told of their Stock Exchange activities, and the Master of Oilybank at any rate had the intelligence to take himself off to remoter regions. The *Nation* draws fine distinctions between the conduct of the Attorney-General and that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer who, while regarded as no longer suited to act as the guardian of the public purse, is

for some unfathomable reason to be allowed to continue his Rake's Progress at the Local Government Board.

Prophecy is peculiarly at a discount just now so one is scarcely tempted to hazard a prediction as to the probable course of events. It would doubtless be better for the Government and the Coalition—and, needless to say, for the country, which however counts for little—to part with confessed Marconi-ites. But limpets are tenacious, and they are encouraged to remain where they are by obtuse admirers, so the Cabinet will become involved in common ruin.

It is almost an impertinence nowadays to refer to public opinion, which is held in supreme contempt by professional politicians between elections. Nevertheless it exists and will make itself heard and felt. We onlookers at the great parliamentary game which one side fights with the naked fists and the other with kid gloves, are entitled to know, after all that has happened in the shape of the systematic miscarriage of truth, if any other Ministers and, if so, which Ministers have "invested" in any of the "associated" Marconi Companies during the period of negotiations for a wireless telegraphy contract between the prolific parent and the British Government which opened in March 1910 and is not yet closed because the contract has never been ratified by Parliament. Observe how the matter stands. The indignant, not to say furious, Ministerial disclaimers of October 11, which suggested one thing though they actually said another, spoken with the knowledge and approval of the Prime Minister, have all gone by the board.

The Coalition Press is always strident though inconsistent. Last October it was "Perish the thought that any Minister should ever have held any Marconi share." Now it is "Perish the thought that any Minister shouldn't hold any Marconi share"—except possibly a parent share—provided the transaction occurred after March 7, 1912, when the Agreement, which was no Agreement, and the Contract, which was no Contract, was publicly "announced." In those earlier and happier days Mr. Herbert Samuel took it upon himself to inform the world: "Neither I myself nor any of my colleagues have at any time held one shilling's worth of shares in this Company, directly or indirectly, or have derived one penny profit from the fluctuations in their prices." When cross-examined before the Marconi Select Committee Mr. Samuel

gave the genesis of this statement, which was all the more heinous because, as we now know, he had known for months before he spoke that some of his colleagues were involved in *a*, though not in *the*, Marconi Company. He was asked whether he had agreed with Sir Rufus Isaacs to the restriction of his renunciation to the English shares, and it is only fair that he should be allowed to answer the question in his own language.

> No, not in that form. I not only told him, but I told all my colleagues in the Cabinet the kind of thing I was going to say—not exactly in those words, but generally the statement I proposed to make. I noticed some one or other—I think Mr. Maxse, but I am not quite sure—said that of course no importance could be attached to my statement of October 11, because I made it on behalf of every member of the Cabinet, and I could not possibly know what was the position of every member of the Cabinet. The Committee will readily believe me when I say that I should not have thought of making the statement in that form unless I had previously ascertained that the facts were so, and I had taken the opportunity of mentioning to my colleagues that in my view it was very necessary to contradict specifically the statements that had been made.

Accordingly

> I said it would be impossible for me in speaking in the Debate, to refer to particular Ministers whose names had been mentioned in rumours but not in the Press, and if I made any statement at all it ought to refer to the whole of the Cabinet, and I informed my colleagues generally that I proposed to say that no Member of the Cabinet ever had any shares in this company with which the contract was made, and that if there was any reason why I could not properly make that statement I should be obliged if they would inform me beforehand. As none of them did inform me beforehand I naturally assumed, of course, that none of them had had any such dealings, and I made my statement in that form.

This conversation must have occurred in Cabinet Council because Mr. Herbert Samuel speaks of informing " my colleagues generally," which he could scarcely have done in separate conversations or by private notes. It was simply a case of silence being interpreted as consent!

The reader will be anxious to know whether the Cabinet was treated with the same disingenuousness as the House of Commons? We know that at the date of this Cabinet Council, on the eve of the Marconi Debate, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George, Sir Rufus Isaacs, and Mr. Herbert Samuel were all aware of the first American transaction. Were the other members of the Cabinet equally informed or were they allowed to remain in the dark? Did they interpret Mr. Samuel's statement as it was interpreted by the public as a comprehensive repudiation of

all transactions in all Marconi Companies, or did they have inside knowledge of the odious deception practised upon Parliament, that it was only intended to apply to the English Marconi Company and left aside the American, the Spanish, the Canadian, and other Marconi Companies in which speculation was permissible during the negotiations between the parent Company and the British Government? Did they or any of them sit by while a false impression was conveyed by their colleagues? Were they victims or deceivers?

These are no idle questions, because after the manner in which we have been treated the public are entitled to know the truth in order that they may form an opinion of the character of the men now governing this country. Mr. Asquith's responsibility is plainly fixed by his acquiescence in a disingenuous repudiation. The guilt of the actual speakers in the Debate has been established by the *Matin* case and by their evidence before the Select Committee. But what was the position of the rest of the Cabinet when Mr. Herbert Samuel informed them of the statement he contemplated making. Did they understand his enquiry as confined to one Marconi Company, "this company," or did they give it and his speech the wider interpretation placed upon it by the nation as well as the *Nation?* In other words, did they or any of them apart from those we know acquiesce in the fraud practised on that fatal Friday, when there was no time to tell the whole truth, or did they suffer the common deception? Mr. Lloyd George was in so deplorable a condition when giving evidence that it would perhaps be unfair to take his statements too seriously, but he said that he had told his colleagues generally of his American speculations. The matter must be cleared up because the character of our public men is a public asset and we are entitled to know where we are and where they are. We must know the whole truth about them all. In lieu of indignant disclaimers, embracing "colleagues," *i.e.*, members of the Ministry as well as members of the Cabinet, we are now left with the individual declaration of the particular Ministers who have given evidence on oath that there have been no Marconi investments outside the American Company, plus the frantic outburst of Mr. Winston Churchill, who unfortunately was not cross-examined, "I have never at any time in any circumstances, directly or indirectly, had any investment or any interest of any

kind, however vaguely it may be described, in Marconi telegraphic shares or any other shares of that description in this or any other country of the inhabited globe—never. And if anybody at any time has said so, that person is a liar, and a slanderer; and if, anybody has repeated this statement and said he had no evidence, and he believed it to be false, but there it was, the only difference between that person and a liar and a slanderer is that he is a coward in addition." The Churchill claque, which is strong in the Press, though nowhere else, was lost in admiration at this calculated frenzy, but the thoughts of Mr. Churchill's luckless colleagues upon it would be worth a penny. They had spent many hours and several days—in vindicating their Marconi speculations (and they appear to have succeeded to the complete satisfaction of certain Coalition Members of the Select Committee) as meritorious investments of hard-earned savings. Mr. Falconer, who may not inaccurately be described as the leading counsel for the prosecution of journalists who repeated rumours, and leading counsel for the defence of Ministers when the truth of these rumours had been established, had positively purred over the American affair in a passage quoted in last month's *National Review*, which as a specimen of unctuous rectitude merits reproduction.

MR. FALCONER: It (*i.e.*, the American Company) was a company in which the strictest purist in these matters might have been pleased to have an interest?

SIR RUFUS ISAACS: So far as I was aware, yes.

Q. Any member of the House?—*A.* Oh, yes.

Q. Or any member of the Bar or the Bench. I am putting it in the most absolute way?—*A.* Quite.

Q. To make it clear, because it is a little difficult to realise after all that has been said—or the highest dignitaries in the Church who had money to invest might properly have made an investment in the American Marconi Company?—*A.* I should have thought so.

Q. Having heard all that you have heard, are you able to see any reason, apart from the fact of your being in the Government, if I may put that in the first place, any ground upon which (again I use the words) the strictest purist in those matters could take any exception to the manner in which the purchase was made?—*A.* No, I do not know that any exception has been taken, certainly in my view it could not be.

And yet, after all this billing and cooing between Counsel for the Post Office and the Attorney-General we have the First Lord of the Admiralty flouncing into Committee Room No. 12 like a hysterical housemaid unjustly accused of stealing the spoons and slanging the Committee as though they

had committed the crime of crimes in affording him an opportunity of repudiating baseless rumours connecting his name with Marconi speculations. The whole case of the Coalition Press and the salvation of his colleagues rested on the assumed innocuousness of any transactions in any subsidiary Marconi Companies after March 7, 1912. The tantrums of the First Lord, which was one of the least edifying of many unedifying scenes before the Select Committee apparently extended to any wireless speculations in any part of the planet, the mere suggestion of which was savagely repudiated as a stain on the spotless escutcheon of one of the many *Bayards sans peur et sans reproche* composing the present Cabinet.

In the name of wonder where are we and where are Ministers? Matters cannot remain as they are after all the hanky-panky of the last six months. Should the Marconi Committee close without securing statements on oath from every Minister that they have never "invested" in any Marconi shares whatsoever during "the close season," the public will be tempted to draw conclusions as unfavourable concerning other Members of the Cabinet as they have already drawn concerning the Prime Minister who, though he may never have speculated in Marconi shares, has allowed his colleagues to do so, while he is officially and personally responsible for one of the worst gambles with the truth in the annals of the Mother of Parliaments.

L. J. Maxse.

P.S. May I say that I should be much obliged if the writer of the letter sufficiently indicated by the following extracts would communicate with me.

Name of place given: *February* 13, 1913.

Dear Sir,—I hate to see a man put upon for exposing, or trying to, any underhand gambles; so if you don't already know I beg to offer you the undermentioned facts, and may they be useful to you in your fight against the powers that be.

There is a young man on the Stock Exchange named . . . . The firm he *was* with then made a fortune on the bear tack by the fall in South African mines which took place on the publishing of the Chinese slavery lies. Since then I am led to believe he is with . . . . That I am not sure of, but that the firm I mention made a large sum in Marconi's shares is common knowledge.

It was done mostly by options here and abroad and many orders executed here, came through Dutch exchanges; if the firm's books could be produced for examination, all, or nearly all, your charges would be substantiated.

Yours,

A Well Wisher.

PRIOR'S "PEGGY"

LADY MARGARET CAVENDISH HOLLES HARLEY, otherwise Her Grace the Duchess of Portland, and (for the purposes of this paper) the "noble, lovely, little Peggy" of Matthew Prior, should certainly not be dismissed as a negligible eighteenth-century figure. Without possessing the triumphant charm of the poet's "Kitty"—that imperious Katherine Hyde who, as Duchess of Queensberry, subjugated the untamable Swift, and petted and pampered peach-loving John Gay—Margaret Harley remains interesting both by her personality and her environment. From her father and her grandfather she inherited the "virtuoso whim" which made her, almost from childhood, a collector of curiosities; she was learned in natural history, botany and domestic medicine; she was a past-mistress in the manifold "accomplishments" of her period, including some that even then must have been exceptional; and she succeeded in attracting about her several of the cleverest of her feminine contemporaries. She made an admirable wife to "the handsomest man in England;" she was an affectionate and judicious mother, and she may justly claim to rank among the more memorable of the "*grandes dames*" of the Georgian era. Her letters, and the letters of her correspondents, are an inexhaustible lucky-bag of those detached social details which, trifling in themselves, serve, when brought together, to give congruity and precision to the picture of a time.

She was born in London on February 11, 1715—her father being Edward, Lord Harley, son of Robert Harley, first Earl of Oxford and Mortimer. Her mother, Henrietta (or Harriet) Cavendish Holles, was the daughter and heir of the first Duke of Newcastle. At Lord Harley's seat of Wimpole in Cambridgeshire she first became known to Prior, who then had not long to

live. There, or at Westminster, he saw her frequently, and seems to have been charmed by her infantile attractions. When she is no more than two years old, he sends his "love"—for it is a very pure and innocent passion—"to little Margaretta." His letters to her parents seldom fail to mention her affectionately, with every variety of "dear diminutive," English and Latin. She is the "*Chara Infantula*," the "*chère ange*," "little Pearl," "her Peggiety," the "little incomparable Lady," his "dear friend and honoured Peggy." When he sends her mother a present of eight pigeons, the first tribute he has received from his new estate at Down Hall in Essex, it is coupled with an express injunction that two of them, "properly incrusted with sweetbreads and 'sparagrass,'" * shall be roasted immediately "for his dear little Lady's private table." † He drinks her health on all occasions "*de tout son cœur*"; and when, being, as he says, "a very laborious poet," he turns a complimentary couplet to her father in the library at Wimpole (it is not one of his best), nothing gratifies him so much as to hear "little Mademoiselle Harley" repeat it the next morning "with the prettiest tone and manner imaginable." ‡ Finally he writes her a rhymed epistle:

My noble, lovely, little PEGGY,
Let this, my FIRST-EPISTLE, beg ye,
At dawn of morn, and close of even,
To lift your heart and hands to heaven:
In double beauty say your pray'r,
Our father first, then *notre père*;
And, dearest CHILD, along the day,
In ev'ry thing you do and say,
Obey and please my LORD and LADY,
So GOD shall love, and ANGELS aid, Ye.

If to these PRECEPTS You attend,
No SECOND-LETTER need I send,
And so I rest Your constant Friend,
M. P.

This bears date April 9, 1720.§ In the following year Prior

* Steele also speaks of "Chickens and Sparagrass" in *Tatler* No. 150, which shows that the corruption must have been current.

† Portland MSS. (Hist. MSS. Comm.) 1899, v, 620. ‡ Ibid, v, 611.

§ Bath MSS. (Hist. MSS. Comm.) 1908, iii, 481.

died at Wimpole after a brief illness. He had composed more than one epitaph "for his own monument"; but perhaps the truest testimony to his individual charm is the after-statement of "Peggy" herself—as reported by Lady Louisa Stuart—that he was "beloved by every living thing in the house—master, child, and servant, human creature or animal." *

There is a portrait of Margaret Harley about this date by the popular Swede, Michael Dahl, who painted her father. In this she appears as a quaint, long-waisted, stiff-skirted little personage, with hair tightly drawn back from an abnormally high forehead. But despite the flat and uninspired manner of the master, the picture probably reproduces with sufficient fidelity the child of five celebrated by what Wraxall terms "Prior's expiring Muse." At all events, save a few formal references in Pope's and Swift's correspondence with her father, it is all we have to rely on until the date of her marriage some fourteen years later. Her mother, whom Prior qualifies as "*adoranda,*" seems to have been more amiable than intellectual. She is also described as exceedingly proud, and a great stickler for the straitest buckram of etiquette. With the wits who were her husband's habitual associates—Prior always excepted—she got on but ill, and (said her daughter) hated Pope in particular. Lord Harley, a kind-hearted, indolent, unambitious man, was a confirmed dilettant and connoisseur, to whom belongs the credit of completing the famous Harleian collection of MSS., begun by his father, and now in the British Museum. In the further prosecution of his "taste," he also seems to have contrived to spend (or squander) on pictures, medals, busts and objects of art in general, some £400,000 of his wife's fortune. This was a side of the paternal character which in a measure reflected itself in the daughter, who, from a very early age, began to gather together shells, feathers, precious stones and rarities of all sorts. Under Lady Harley and a governess (Miss Walton), she was carefully brought up, and by the time she was twenty must have been what was then regarded as unusually well-educated. Being an heiress she had soon a number of suitors. On the 11th of July, 1734,

* Lady M. Wortley Montagu's *Works*, by Lord Wharncliffe, 1837, i, 63. It is understood that Mr. Francis Bickley, who recently contributed a very valuable article on Prior to the *Quarterly Review*, is engaged on a much-needed life of the poet.

she became the wife of William Bentinck, second Duke and third Earl of Portland, and, according to his father-in-law, one of the most estimable of men. He was the grandson of King William's famous favourite, and at this date was six-and-twenty. The wedding took place at Oxford Chapel (now St. Peter's, Vere Street), which had been built some ten years before from the designs of the James Gibbs who is responsible for Prior's ornate tomb in Westminster Abbey.

Oxford, Cavendish, Harley, Wimpole, Bentinck and other names connected with the great Portland property thus created, still linger in the region of Marylebone. Indeed the bulk of the parish which (with its nine medicinal springs) had been bought in 1710 by the first Duke of Newcastle, eventually passed to the Duchess. But the immediate result of her marriage was not only to invest her with a prominent social position, but to make her mistress of a convenient house in town and a great country-seat. The town house stood in the old Privy-Garden at Whitehall, occupying the site of the apartments by the water-side once tenanted by Charles II, and still easily discernible on Fisher's well-known plan of the palace.* The Duke's grandfather had obtained a building lease of the ground from William III as far back as 1696. Two years later, in the second fire at Whitehall, the so-called "Earl of Portland's lodgings," with the adjacent Banqueting House of Inigo Jones, fortunately escaped destruction; although both—says a contemporary record—were "much damnified"; (†) and it must have been after this catastrophe that the building so long inhabited by Margaret Harley was constructed or completed. Many years subsequent to her death, its place was taken by No. 4, Whitehall Gardens, the home of Sir Robert Peel, who, substituting a new house for the old one, resided here until his fatal accident in 1850, which is, of course, far beyond the limits of this paper. But these apparently gratuitous particulars are justified by the mournful fact that the Whitehall Gardens of to-day, with all its time-honoured memories, must presently be superseded by a range of modern—and probably painfully modern—government offices!

* This, by the way, was dedicated to the second Duke.

† Hope Johnstone papers (Fifteenth Report of the Hist. MSS. Comm., App. Pt. ix, 1897, p. 103).

The Duke's country-seat, Bulstrode or Bulstrode Park, in Buckinghamshire, lies to the west of Gerard's Cross, on the left hand of the high road from Uxbridge to Beaconsfield.* The house, erected by a former proprietor, Judge Jeffreys, has long made room for a later structure. Horace Walpole, who saw it in 1755, describes it as "a melancholy monument of Dutch magnificence," having, nevertheless, "a brave gallery of old pictures, and a chapel with two fine windows of modern painted glass." And although in 1762 the Duchess made him a handsome present of "portraits of the court of Louis Quatorze" (which can scarcely have been improved by the fact that they had been used as targets in the nursery), he is still ungrateful enough to write of the place in the following year as "Dutch and trist." Mrs. Lybbe Powys, who inspected it subsequently, is scarcely as critical as fastidious Mr. Walpole. It is well worth seeing, she reports; and she praises the paintings and curiosities, especially "a Holy Family as large as life, by Raphael," and "The Building of Antwerp" from Sir Luke Schaub's collection:

The hall (she goes on) is surround'd by very large pieces of every kind of beast by Snyders.† The menagerie, I had heard, was the finest in England, but in that I was disappointed, as the spot is by no means calculated to show off the many beautiful birds it contains, of which there were great variety, as a curassoa, goon (?) crown-bird, stork, black and red game, bustards, red-legg'd partridges, silver, gold, pied pheasants, one, what is reckon'd exceedingly curious, the peacock pheasant. The aviary, too, is a most beautiful collection of smaller birds—tumblers, waxbills, yellow and bloom paraquets, Java sparrows, Loretta blue birds, Virginia nightingales, and two widow-birds, of . . . "red-breasted long twit'd finches." Besides all above mention'd, her Grace is exceedingly fond of gardening, is a very learned botanist, and

* The Duchess of Portland preferred to spell it Bullstrode, and those who—with Captain Fluellen—decline to "mock at an ancient tradition," will excuse if they cannot imitate her. According to Burke's *Vicissitudes of Families*, the estate, in the days of the "galloping Normans," was held by a sturdy Saxon named Shobbington, who, when the Conqueror granted the land to one of his retainers, prepared to contest the transfer. He and his friends had no horses; but they had a number of bulls. Mounting these improvised chargers, they fell at nightfall on the invading camp, and put it to flight. After this daring exploit, Shobbington was summoned to Court, a mandate to which he responded riding on a bull, and escorted by seven stalwart sons. In the sequel, he took the oath to William, and was allowed to keep his property. The Duchess, believing devoutly in the "bull-striders," always insisted on writing the name of the place with the second "l."

† These were probably the pictures described in Britton and Brayley as Hunting Scenes by Snyders and his Pupil, i, p. 393.

has every English plant in a separate garden by themselves. Upon the whole, I never was more entertain'd than at Bulstrode. *

The date of Mrs. Lybbe Powys' visit to Bulstrode was July 1769, and her description of the "menagerie" is of necessity an anticipation. But whatever the defects or beauties of the mansion, its environment was magnificent. The pleasure-gardens were held by judges to be perfect; and the surrounding park of some eight hundred acres, "composed of perpetual swells and slopes, set off by scattered plantations, disposed in the justest taste," † was one of the most beautiful in England. Fine old trees abounded; and there were walks which offered effective "prospects" of Windsor Forest and the blue hills of Surrey. So various in their expanse were these extensive grounds as to prompt the story that the second Duke was once actually stopped in his own domain by the notorious Dick Turpin—a pleasant legend which is chronologically possible, as Turpin was hanged in 1739. Nowadays it would be easy to get to Gerard's Cross from Whitehall under an hour; but in 1735 it was frequently made a leisurely affair, to be broken at Acton. Yet on occasion, it could be performed *à grande vitesse*, as for example in January 1739. "We set out from Bulstrode at eleven, and were in town by half an hour over two, over hills of snow and heaps of ice; but our horses flew as if each had been a Pegasus—four coaches and six, with twelve horsemen attending, besides apothecaries, bakers, butchers, that joined in the procession to escort us part of the way." And this cavalcade could not have included the servants' hall, for the same letter relates that one of the Duchess's maids, travelling by the waggon, was thrown out, run over and died in consequence.‡

At Bulstrode the new Duchess spent much of her time; and here, as she says in one of her letters, her amusements were "all of the Rural kind—Working, Spinning, Knotting, Drawing, Reading, Writing, Walking, and picking Herbs to put into an Herbal." § These things, however, by no means exhausted the list of her occupations. She was a clever turner both in wood

* *Passages from the Diaries of Mrs. Philip Lybbe Powys*, 1899, pp. 120–1.

† *Ambulator*, 1800, p. 48.

‡ Delany *Autobiography*, &c, 1861, ii, 23, 25.

§ *Elizabeth Montagu*, by Emily S. Climenson, 1906, i, 27.

and ivory; she excelled in all kinds of fancy-work, from "sugar plum" chair-covers to embroidered aprons; she was an expert in shell-flowers and grotto-building; she delighted in feather-screens* and cut-paper, in botany and natural history, in curios and bric-à-brac of all sorts. Like a true "Lady Bountiful," she dabbled in the old-fashioned remedies of the still-room—infusions of poppy and camomile, decoctions of dandelion and penny-royal.† She talks of the tamarinds she has ordered for her "apothecary's shop." "I am a *great doctor*—she says on another occasion—and have cured a poor boy of dropsy." As a letter-writer, she was fluent and assiduous; but scarcely to be compared with some of the practised correspondents she had the good sense to attract and retain; and it is they who furnish us with the best idea of the life at Bulstrode. Foremost of these were the two Granvilles, Mary, then the widow of Mr. Pendarves and afterwards the better-known Mrs. Delany, and her sister, Anne, later Mrs. D'Ewes; Mrs. (or rather Miss) Donnellan, a clever Irish friend of Swift and Richardson; Elizabeth Robinson, eventually the celebrated Mrs. Montagu, and Catherine, or Kitty, Dashwood, the "Delia-Neaera" of Hammond's lovesick *Elegies*. Another was John Law's daughter, a pretty, half-French Lady Wallingford. Like Johnson, the Duchess was fond of giving pet names to her favourites. Mrs. Pendarves was "Pen" or "Penny": Miss Robinson, who was young and very volatile, "Fidget"; Anne Granville, "Pipkin"; Miss Dashwood, "Dash." Two of the group, "Fidget" and "Pen," were accomplished

* Mrs Montagu is usually associated with the famous feather-hangings celebrated by Cowper (*Gentleman's Magazine*, June 1788). But the idea originated with the Duchess of Portland.

† These were the days when people took cowslip-wine for sleeplessness, added saffron to their tea against low spirits, and put goose-grass in their spring-porridge as "good for the scurvy." An approved recipe for toothache was trefoil, primrose leaves, and pounded yarrow. Vipers were still used medicinally; and Elixir of Vitriol was recommended for asthma. Snails, also, were popular, not as the table-delicacy referred to in Bramston's *Man of Taste*, but to cure consumption. Some of the other remedies read oddly. Mrs. Delany speaks of a spider in a goose-quill, hung round a child's neck, as infallible in ague; and one of Mrs. Montagu's correspondents relates the lamentable case of an aged Countess of Northampton who succumbed after a treatment of broth prepared from a cock which had been previously dosed for the purpose by Dr. Ward's celebrated Pill.

chroniclers. Here is "Fidget's" account of the Bulstrode *carte du jour*:

We breakfast at 9, dine at 2, drink tea at 8, and sup at 10. In the morning we work or read. In the afternoon the same, walk from 6 till tea-time, and then write till supper. I think since we came down our despatches in numbers, tho' not in importance, have equalled those at the Secretary's Office. The Duchess and I have been walking in the woods to-night, and feeding the pheasants in the menagerie. The late Duke had Macaws, Parrots, and all sorts of foreign birds flying in one of the woods; he built a house and kept people to wait upon them; there are now some birds in the house, and one Macaw, but most were destroyed in the Duke's minority.*

This was in 1740. An earlier letter from the already indefatigable Mrs. Pendarves to her sister gives a variation of the picture. She is copying some drawings of Stonehenge lent her by Lord Oxford:

They have employed me two mornings, and will two mornings more, so that my writing-hour is drove down to the evening. Well, I must drink coffee at five, and play with the little jewels—it is the ceremony of the house: then says the Duchess, "Don't go, Penny, till I have net one row in my cherry-net," which proves a hundred meshes, then comes some prater, asks her Grace a question; the arm suspended in the air forgets its occupation; she answers, and asks some other question in return—ten to one but a laugh is hatched, and once in a quarter of an hour the netting-work is remembered! With patience I await her solemn motions, and by half an hour after six we are in the dressing room [*i.e.* boudoir], armed with pen and ink, and the fair field prepared to receive the attack. Then comes Lady Elizabeth, Lady Harriet, and the noble Marquis [the three children]; after half an hour's jumping, they are dismissed, and we soberly say "Now we will write our letters." In comes the Duke, "*the tea stays for the ladies*": well, we must go, for there is no living at Bulstrode without four meals a-day. . . .†

The result is that it is eight before the correspondence is resumed, and ready for his Grace to frank it. The children mentioned were Elizabeth, the eldest, afterwards first Marchioness of Bath; Henrietta, who became Countess of Stamford and Warrington; and William Henry (Lord Titchfield), eventually third Duke of Portland, at this date only a few months old. They were all engaging little people, and were presently to have an exemplary preceptress in the person of that accomplished Anglo-Saxon scholar, Miss (or Mrs.) Elizabeth Elstob, who, by the death of Caroline of Ansbach, had lost both her patron and her pension. It is strange that a lady who knew eight

* *Elizabeth Montagu*, by Emily J. Climenson, 1906, i, 49–50.

† Delany, *Autobiography*, &c., 1861, ii, 21–22.

ges should n[illegible] Lord Oxf[illegible]
But the Duchess sensibly decided that it would [illegible] Elstob contrived to teach her pupils English, cultivated their minds to the extent of their capacities, and instructed them "in the principles of religion and virtue." * She wished moreover to relieve them from the frigid formalities and vexatious constraint under which she herself had fretted as a child, and she hoped that in this way they would grow up affectionate and unaffected. Her plan must have succeeded, since, some years later, Mrs. Pendarves praises them for just these qualities. Miss Elstob remained in the Portland family until her death in 1756.

Apart from the periodical advent of visitors, and the unwearied activities of the Duchess, mingled with a good deal of miscellaneous reading (in which the *Decameron* alternated with Clarke's Sermons, and Young's *Night Thoughts* corrected the levity of Cibber's *Apology*), the life at Bulstrode must have been, if not exactly monotonous, at least exceedingly uniform. But it was another-guess matter when the caravan, with its four coaches-and-six, transferred the family to the Privy Garden, and the days were filled with "Operas, Park, Assemblies, Vaux Hall"—when there were sittings at Hudson's or Zincke's and Handel oratorios and Caffarelli concerts—when Quin was acting Jaques superbly in *As You Like It* and the Italian Dancers were only rivalled in popularity by the new anonymous novel of *Pamela*—when there were masquerades at Marylebone and balls at Leicester House. Perhaps the best illustration of what may be regarded as a decorous high-life "frisk" of those days is afforded by the record of an expedition to which the Duke and Duchess convened a select number of friends. The proceedings were reported independently by two of those present, whose accounts we combine. The party consisted of the host and hostess; Mrs. Pendarves and Miss Donnellan; Lady Wallingford; Dr. Shaw, the traveller and botanist; Lord Dupplin, the Duchess's cousin, afterwards Earl of Kinnoul; and an eccentric M. Achard, who had formerly been the Duke's tutor and was now his secretary and factotum. M. Achard, known familiarly in the family as "Frère Bona-

* Delany *Autobiography*, &c., 1861, ii, 14.

venture," was of uncertain temper, a circumstance which led to his being nicknamed "M. du Poivre," or "M. du Miel," according to his dominant mood. The intention was to visit all the shows between Whitehall and the Tower, and the sightseers accordingly set out at ten in two hackney coaches, "stopping at everything that had a name." The first halt was at the "*wild beasts*" in Covent Garden; but as Mrs. Pendarves italicises the words, and Cunningham makes no mention of any Covent Garden menagerie, it is uncertain whether animals are really to be understood. The next was at Saint Bartholomew's Hospital, where, on the great staircase, they inspect Mr. William Hogarth's comparatively recent attempts in the Grand Style, the *Good Samaritan* and the *Pool of Bethesda* (which Mrs. Pendarves misnames the *Impotent Man*). From "Bart's" they pass to the famous lapidary, Mr. Faulkner, where are "abundance of fine things," and they are initiated into the cutting and polishing of pebbles. At Surgeons' Hall, in Monkwell Street, they visit the so-called picture by Holbein of Henry VIII, granting a Charter to the Barber Surgeons; after which they proceed to the Tower and Mint to recreate themselves with the assay of gold and silver and the spectacle of lions and armour. Next comes an excellent dinner at Pontack's in Abchurch Lane, where you might have the best Bordeaux wine in all France, and dine at five shillings or a guinea a head, as it pleased your pocket. After dinner, they adjourned to the "round church in Stocks Market," * that is, St. Stephen's Walbrook, which, architectural experts notwithstanding, is assuredly one of Wren's most beautiful works. "And so home to Whitehall"—as Pepys would conclude, having passed, in Miss Donnellan's opinion, "a most agreeable day." What the untunable M. Achard thought on this occasion is not recorded. Let us trust he had not found the Pontack claret sophisticated! †

This "notable expedition," as Mrs. Pendarves calls it, took

* Delany, *Autobiography*, &c., 1861, ii, 82 In April 1740, it may be added, the Stocks Market had been moved to Farringdon Street, and the Mansion House was rising on its site, which probably retained its old name for some time.

† For sure those *Honest Fellows* have no knack
Of putting off *stum'd Claret* for *Pontack*.
The Hind and the Panther transvers'd, 1687, p. 27.

place in April 1740, and must also have been "extraordinary" (in the eighteenth-century sense), as there are no similar records. Nor are they to be looked for, since the unchequered life of the Duchess, like that of those fortunate people who avoid a history, presents, in the way of definite chronicle, but few memorable milestones. These may be at once enumerated. She had, in due time, other children, besides those mentioned already. In 1741 died Lord Harley, who in 1724 had succeeded his father as second Earl of Oxford. His death (Mrs. Pendarves does not scruple to say it) was mainly due to intemperance, aggravated by the growing embarrassments which had obliged him, a year earlier, to sell Wimpole to Lord Hardwicke. His widow survived him until 1755, having sold the Harleian collection to the British Museum a short time before for £10,000. In 1762 the Duke of Portland died. There is not much about him in the correspondence of Mrs. Montagu or Mrs. Pendarves beyond the fact that he franked letters, and hunted three times a week in the season. But he had the care of a large estate, which must have kept him continually and usefully occupied. As for the Duchess—*les jours se suivent et se ressemblent.* Her mother's death added greatly to her possessions, not only in money but in pictures, miniatures and all the heirlooms of the Nottinghamshire house, Welbeck Abbey. We hear of her continued occupations, her ruling passion for collecting, her improvements at Bulstrode, her tame hares and pheasants, her botanical garden, and her intercourse with her friends. After Miss Robinson's marriage, in 1742, to Mr. Montagu, the intimacy continued, and the husband and wife visited at Bulstrode. But in a few years, in consequence of some misunderstanding, it gradually fell off and was never renewed. On the other hand, the attachment to Mrs. Pendarves survived both her second marriage to Dr. Delany and her second widowhood, the bond being only broken at last by the Duchess's death. It was at Bulstrode, when Mrs. Delany was more than seventy-three, that the idea first occurred to her of that famous paper flora which so delighted George III and Queen Charlotte, and which (by the bequest of Lady Llanover) still constitutes one of the glories of the Print Room at Bloomsbury. One day the old lady had casually cut out a scarlet geranium in paper of similar colour, with such verisimilitude

that the Duchess mistook it for the real flower, and from that moment "a new work was begun." It was continued until 1782, and then only relinquished from fading eyesight.*

Hitherto we have said little of the men visitors to Bulstrode Park. One reason, and that almost suffices, is that there is not very much to say. The chosen associates of the Duchess were mostly of her own sex; or, if not, were particularly connected with her particular hobbies. Of these latter was the botanist and conchologist, Dr. Thomas Shaw, an explorer whose *Travels in Barbary and the Levant* obtained and deserved the praise of Gibbon. The loud talk and hearty laughter of this "Godfather of all Shell Fish" (as Mrs. Montagu calls him) were often heard at Bulstrode; and the Duchess is said to have given him £600 to travel and collect shells for her, an act in which she plainly showed herself her father's daughter. Others in this category were Mr. (afterwards Sir) Joseph Banks and the Swede, Solander, who, on their return from Cook's expedition of 1768-71, spent much of the summer of 1772 at Bulstrode preparing an account of their experiences. The "simpling Macaroni," as the caricaturists called Solander, should have been at his ease in the Duchess's herb-garden. Of purely literary visitors the list is not large. One of the earliest was doubtless Dr. Conyers Middleton, whose *Life of Cicero*—by no means an unimportant factor in the emancipation of biography from the traditional models—was highly popular; another, Lyttelton's friend, Gilbert West of Wickham, who, besides his book on the Resurrection, had translated Pindar and Lucian's *Triumph of the Gout*, to which he was himself a martyr. West's taste for decoration cannot fail to have made him a *persona grata* at Bulstrode. Dr. Zachary Grey, that laborious editor of *Hudibras*, who, according to Fielding, quotes in his notes more than five hundred books *not* to be found in Mead's library, was also an occasional guest. But the most frequent and the most constant was Dr. Edward Young, the author of the *Night Thoughts*† and

* Delany, *Autobiography*, &c., 1862, v, 443; vi, 98. Cutting paper was a famous eighteenth-century "accomplishment," and Lady Andover is said to have excelled in minute figures and landscapes executed in this way. The art probably came over from Holland with William of Orange.

† Night the Third. Narcissa—was "humbly Inscrib'd to her Grace the Duchess of P——" in 1742.

the *Centaur not Fabulous*, whose conversational charm and gift of letter-writing are often extolled. Of foreign *littérateurs*, the most important is that quaint (and diminutive) figure Father Pierre-François le Courayer, the translator of Sarpi's *Council of Trent*, who, after writing a book vindicating the Orders of the English Church, had taken refuge in this country in 1728. At Bulstrode, when he could tear himself from Oxford, where Atterbury had obtained him a Doctor's degree, or from the lodgings over Mrs. Chenevix's toy-shop at Charing Cross, he was always welcome, as at many other aristocratic houses which opened their doors to him. Lastly there must have been another comer, of whose doings we should certainly like to know more. Rousseau was in England in 1766–7 and spent much of his time at Wootton in Derbyshire, near Calwich, where lived Mrs. Delany's relative, Bernard Granville, to whom Jean Jacques wrote several letters. Among these, Lady Llanover found one evidently intended for the Duchess of Portland, as it refers to a title which, Rousseau says, she had permitted him to assume, namely, that of "*Herboriste de Madame la Duchesse de Portland.*" There was not much herbalising possible in the Privy-Garden at Whitehall; and it is only reasonable to conclude that the distinction must have been conferred at Bulstrode.*

Concerning the Duchess's relations with some of the other notabilities of her day, the record is disappointingly barren. She knew, and had given presents to, Horace Walpole; but beyond two lines in a letter to George Montagu saying that she had dined at Strawberry Hill with Mrs. Delany in June 1770, there is no trace of intimacy. On the other hand, a few days later, Mrs. Delany gives a fairly detailed account of a visit she made with her great friend, and her great friend's daughter, Lady Weymouth, to Garrick at Hampton. The distinguished actor, though no doubt delighted, was not dumbfounded. He did the honours of his riverside villa† "*very respectfully*"; and Mrs. Garrick—"*a wonderful creature*"—was propriety itself, "considering all circumstances relating to her"—meaning, we suppose, that she had once been an opera-dancer. The house, though "singular," had "the look of belonging to *a genius*"; the excellent dinner was "nicely served"; and the pretty garden sloping to the Thames

* Delany, *Autobiography*, &c., 1862, v, 98, 140. † Just sold, *Times*, April 21, 1914.

"very well laid out, and planted for shade and shelter." They drank tea and coffee in Shakespeare's temple under Roubillac's statue (now in the British Museum); and they duly admired the famous Shakespeare chair.* Later on, Lady Weymouth's children walked into the garden, and Garrick made himself as agreeable as he knew how to do. The expedition must have been wholly satisfactory; but Mrs. Delany's narrative is spoiled by a note of condescension which one hardly expects in Burke's typical fine lady. One would like to hear Garrick's version of the proceedings, or better, Mrs. Garrick's—"considering all circumstances relating to her." Report says that she was a person of marked social charm, extremely well bred, and devoted to her "Davy."†

But if Bulstrode patronised Hampton, Bulstrode in its turn was patronised by Gunnersbury House, for, two years later, Mrs. Delany gives an elaborate account of a "gracious visit" which, in the autumn of 1772 (the year of the opening of the Pantheon), that indefatigable gadabout, the Princess Amelia, paid the Duchess. Here it is:

All the comfortable sophas and great chairs, all the piramids of books (adorning *almost every chair*), all the tables and *even the spinning-wheel* were banish'd for that day, and the blew damask chairs set in prim form around the room, only one arm'd chair placed in the middle for her Royal Highness; she came in a post coach and four, only attended by two footmen and a groom . . . They were here by a qr after one, conducted by the keeper, who met them at the end of the common, and were brought (not the common way), but thro' "*the bosom.*" The Dss. met her [the Princess] at the hall-door, and I stood in the hall; when the Princess had paid her complimts to her Grace, she came up directly to me and said many civil things wch I hope I answer'd properly. She was so easy, good-humoured and entertaining, that I was glad I had not absented myself. She was delighted with the place and her entertainment, which was magnificent and pollish'd to the last degree, yet everything conducted with the utmost ease. The Princess went all over the house and garden, but insisted upon the Dss. of P. and my not attending her there, only her ladies. We dined at three, and she had a polite attention to every ingenious ornament on the table and you may be sure Mr. Leiver's [the chef's ?] ingenuity, &c., was *not idle* on this occasion. After dinner she would see my own apartments, and made me display

* Mrs. Delany calls this "*Shakespeare's own chair*"; but, from her description it was obviously the mahogany nondescript designed by Hogarth for Garrick, as president of the Shakespeare Club. It afterwards belonged to the late Baroness Burdett Coutts. There is a sketch of it in S. Ireland's *Graphic Illustrations*, 1799, ii, 147.

† *Delany, Autobiography*, &c., 1862, iv, 283-4.

all my frippery works, all which she graciously commended; we then adjourned into the library, and at seven the Princess return'd to Gunnersbury by moonlight.*

The graciousness of Gunnersbury House was, however, nothing compared with the affability of Windsor Castle, when, on a memorable day in August 1776, "Great George our King" and Queen Charlotte drank tea at Bulstrode, and Mrs. Delany (in her own words) was "produced among the antiquities." Between six and seven their serene Majesties" arrived in a chaise and pair, bringing with them Lady Weymouth. The house, as before, had been turned upside down to receive them, and "the drawing room divested of every comfortable circumstance." The royal visitors "took notice, and admired everything"—especially the Duchess and the *hortus siccus*. The intercourse thus opened was afterwards often renewed. In August 1778, on the Prince of Wales's birthday, the King and Queen, with eight children and attendants, fifty in all, breakfasted at Bulstrode. Mrs. Delany was again "commandeered," her paper flowers were inspected by a larger party than before, and the good-humoured royalties perambulated the entire house, admiring the pictures, the china closet and the numberless curiosities. They then had chocolate in the gallery, and the King carried his amiability to the extent of handing Mrs. Delany a chair. This invasion of Bulstrode was followed by a return visit to Windsor, as Mrs. Delany had expressed a desire to see the entire royal family. It came off the next day, when the Duchess and her interesting friend went to the Castle, and were received with much simple cordiality, including the privilege of seeing the Prince of Wales and the Bishop of Osnaburg (Prince Frederick) dance a minuet in the drawing room at the Queen's house. Mrs. Delany's account of these proceedings (she was now nearing eighty) is something too much in the worm-and-star style, but the narrative gives a pleasant impression of the genuine courtesy and unconventional kindness of "Farmer George" and his wife. In a later letter there is a pretty picture of the King, carrying about in his arms his youngest-born, the short-lived Prince Octavius; and in another, later still, although, as a preliminary, the illustrious guests were escorted through Bulstrode park with blazing flambeaux, and the Duchess lighted in their honour the great

* Delany, *Autobiography*, &c., 1862, iv, 455–6.

chandelier which had not been lit for twenty years, the Queen chatted with her hostess on a sofa, the Princess Royal played the harpsichord while the Prince of Wales sang, and the company consumed their refreshments as naturally as if they had been simple citizens in a supper-box at Vauxhall.

So much for royalty. It would be interesting to connect the Duchess with her illustrious contemporary, the "great Cham of Literature." But beyond the fact that, in the year of the Gordon Riots, Dr. Johnson met her Grace at one of Mrs. Vesey's "Babels," Boswell makes no reference to that "fair conjunction." On the other hand, the *Diary* of Miss Burney for January 1783 contains a lively sketch of an interview which, greatly to her satisfaction, the much-flattered author of the then recently published *Cecilia* had with the Duchess at Mrs. Delany's house in St. James's Place. Miss Burney discovered much "sweetness and dignity and intelligence" in her new friend. The Duchess was wonderfully gracious, at once accepting Fanny's opinion of Mrs. Siddons as final. She further delighted her hearer by announcing that, despite an antipathy to five volumes, she had read *Cecilia* three times—a commendation enhanced by the supplementary declaration that she had never been able to get through more than a few letters of *Clarissa* or *Sir Charles Grandison*. But over *Cecilia* both she and Mrs. Delany had cried—oh! how they had cried! Then followed discussion of the *dramatis personæ*, to which Mrs. Chapone (who had accompanied Miss Burney) contributed the familiar vindication of the eccentric Briggs. It had been asserted, in a mixed company, that there could be no such character. Whereupon "a poor little city man who was there started up and said, 'But there is, though, for I'se one myself.'" After this, and some further laudation, Miss Burney's sensitive modesty could "hear no more." Indeed, she has been obliquely accused (by the ever-suspicious Croker, who distrusted reported dialogues) of hearing more than was actually uttered. But she could scarcely have invented this particular episode.*

The Dowager Duchess of Portland, as she had been since the marriage of the third Duke in 1766, died at Bulstrode on the 17th of July, 1785, in her seventy-second year. Her

* Burney, *Diary*, 1904 ii 197–202.

life was not, it may be gathered, fruitful of incident, and therefore lends itself but little to chronological treatment. From the scattered sources consulted for this paper, she emerges indistinctly as a shadowy but beneficent presence,* with a genius for friendship, and a taste for collecting—a taste which, in her later years, does not seem to have entirely commended itself to her expectant and embarrassed heirs. In April 1786, the "Portland Museum," announced in auctioneer phraseology as "known throughout Europe," and consisting of "shells, corals, minerals, insects, birds' eggs, agates, crystals, china, snuff-boxes, coins, medals, seals, prints, drawings, jewels, and precious stones," was sold by Skinner at her Grace's "late dwelling-house in Privy-Garden." The sale occupied thirty-eight days, and included 4156 lots. One of the buyers was Horace Walpole, who secured a head in basalt of Jupiter Serapis and an illuminated Book of Psalms, both of which he forthwith installed in the Beauclerk closet at Strawberry. Another item was a unique set of Hollar's engravings, in 13 folio volumes. This fetched £385, but the prices generally were far below what they would have been in our day. Rembrandt etchings, for example, went for 28s.; Chelsea China (28 pieces) for 30s. The gem of the sale was the blue and white glass Vase, or Sepulchral Urn, thought to have once held ashes of Alexander Severus, which had been discovered near Rome in a sarcophagus under the Monte del Grano. Until 1770 this marvel of the ceramic art had remained in the possession of the Barberini family, being subsequently acquired by Sir William Hamilton, British Plenipotentiary at Naples, from whom, through his niece, Miss Hamilton, one of Queen Charlotte's ladies-in-waiting, the Duchess purchased it for £1800. Henceforth it became known as the Hamilton or Portland Vase. At the sale it was bought in by the third Duke for £1029, and deposited by his son in the British Museum. Here—as all the world knows—it was smashed to pieces in February 1845 by a drunken workman, and was afterwards most ingeniously and successfully pieced together by Mr. Thomas Doubleday.

AUSTIN DOBSON.

* Writing in August 1742, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu says of her daughter, Lady Bute: "I am very glad she continues her intimacy with the Duchess of Portland, whose company will never injure her either by advice or example" (Paston's *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, 1907, 406).

WHY AIRMEN ARE NOT AFRAID

I

HAS the aeroplanist—any typical representative of the several thousand pilots who now navigate the air—such an iron type of nerve as may distinguish him from normal men?

I do not think so—although, no doubt, to an ordinary person, flying would seem to demand, on the part of the airman, a courage quite exceptional. But, in regard to all the perilous tasks for which men are found so eager, the personal point of view, that of the participant himself, is what we need to gauge.

Now, in connection with aviation, it is certainly true to say that the majority of men, when they handle an aeroplane, are imbued with enthusiasm both real and lasting; and, as is generally admitted, there is no such a spirit as genuine enthusiasm for brushing aside difficulties and dangers. Again, the pilot who learns to fly to-day has a confidence which is inspired by the experience of his predecessors in the art. Such knowledge, handed from instructor to pupil, grows ceaselessly; and its accumulation is adding materially to the safety of flight. Thus, aided by data that pioneers have collected for him, and stimulated by his own enthusiasm—to say nothing of being provided with a reliable, airworthy machine—the would-be aviator of to-day need no longer be a superman, either in will-power, or nerve. In the infancy of flight it was, of course, a different matter: the first pilots who flew were, undoubtedly, exceptional men.

What impresses an airman, usually quite early in his flying career, is the sense of safety which comes to him, even when a thousand feet or more above the earth. That this should be so, is not altogether surprising. The modern aeroplane, when it is in flight, suggests nothing of insecurity, or possible mishap. There is the strong, unceasing roar of the motor—the purposeful

rush. Borne forward thus smoothly and irresistibly, and yet with his craft instantly responsive to the merest touch upon its levers, the steersman feels master of the situation—in a word, the conqueror of the air.

But, in reality, his conquest is no more than partial; this new element which he navigates, with such determination and skill, is still treacherous and uncharted. And so, every now and then, his confidence is rudely shaken. Something happens while he is in the air—something unexpected, and quite mysterious. He finds, suddenly, that his machine has passed beyond control; and thereafter, should he escape the worst consequences of his fall, he will entertain a vast respect for this invisible sea which he has the temerity to invade.

At Pau one day—it was while I was learning to fly—I had been delighting myself, and entertaining earth folk, with some aerial manœuvres in a Bleriot monoplane. Nowadays, when trick-flying is a fine art, such evolutions as I was achieving then would pass almost without notice; but, at the time, I certainly thought I was performing rather well—remembering the fact that I was a beginner. Suddenly I attempted a steeply banked turn. I had done identically the same thing just before, in an apparently similar way; but, this time, "something happened." Perhaps, at that critical instant when my planes hung poised, some chance gust of wind threw itself into the balance. At any rate, I found I had no control at all over my machine; and the next moment, plunging down headlong—although, luckily, from no great height—I found myself, with a sadly wrecked craft, lying in the bed of a shallow stream. I escaped with a shaking, fortunately; but such experiences have a salutary effect. They teach one that in the navigation of the air man is—despite his growing store of knowledge—still the merest novice. And it is good that he should be chastened thus.

II

Does an aviator, by facing constantly the perils of the air, gradually become nerve-shaken, and so run the risk of some sudden loss of judgment, which may easily spell disaster?

In pondering such a possibility, a definite point at once emerges. It is that there are several styles of flying—indulged

is, largely, according to the temperament of the airman. There is, for example, the methodical pilot, who flies only when his machine and engine are in perfect trim, and the atmospheric conditions favourable; and, on the other hand, there is the man who is so charged with nervous energy that he cannot rest content with cautious progress. It is he who attempts risky evolutions, who flies in high and gusty winds, and who pilots "freak," racing aircraft.

Between these two types of airmen, from the point of view of the nerve-strain they impose upon themselves, there is scarcely any comparison to be made. The patient, plodding man, proceeding always by logical stages, may fly for years in safety—at any rate, so far as his physical and mental equipment are concerned. But the dashing, adventurous pilot, who performs brilliant and daring feats, makes an abnormal demand upon both nerve and judgment. He may, of course, be so exceptional a man as to withstand the strain; but, where the human element is concerned, there is always a doubt. Becoming "nervy" by degrees, perhaps, and almost unconsciously, he may be faced one day by the need for instant and unerring decision. Then, for no longer perhaps than one fatal moment, his overdriven nerves fail him: for a heart's beat, he is flaccid and uncertain of himself. And so, if the fault be a grave one, the air may claim a further victim.

Tread—or, rather, fly—warily; husband your own resources, as you study those of your motor—such, surely, should be the motto of all airmen, having regard to the present stage of our development.

He who flies constantly must look to one personal risk, which may vary according to the characteristics of the individual. This is the danger a man may incur by becoming a little careless while in the air. There is the possibility, in fact, that familiarity may breed—not actual contempt—but a temporary relaxation of vigilance; and piloting an aeroplane needs such watchfulness, such minute precision, that any "staleness," on the part of the man at the wheel, or lever, represents a peril that is very real. The pilot who flies a great deal should remind himself, constantly, that there is no room for error in the handling of aircraft.

A loss of confidence not difficult to understand is suffered by

an airman, sometimes, after he has been the victim of a serious fall; and in similar circumstances a jockey, or, say, a racing motorist, may be robbed of nerve. When a pilot does lose judgment, as the outcome of a bad mishap, his wisest course is to cease to fly: with a broken nerve, he is a menace to himself, and to others as well.

An aeroplane accident, in its shattering suddenness, has an effect upon some men which is equivalent to the shock inflicted by a railway disaster; their nervous system never recovers from it. Others, surviving perhaps a series of falls, will still pilot a machine with unabated "dash."

Flying, as I have done, for some three and a half years, an occasional accident has, almost inevitably, come my way; and one or two of them—at any rate, to onlookers—have appeared sufficiently alarming. Apart from slight injuries, however, and a general shaking up, both bodily and mental, I have sustained no permanent ill-effects; but such mishaps must, of course, leave their definite impression upon the mind. In my case, they have seemed to tell me this: that in flying one cannot afford to ignore any precaution or act of forethought, however trifling, that may tend to safety.

But, in regard to the mental effect of falls upon the individual man, the problem must, necessarily, remain one of temperament.

III

Certain favourable conditions are essential, if an airman is to fly confidently, and with mental ease.

In the first instance, he must assure himself, before he decides to ascend—and by personal observation—that the weather conditions are such as to render flight reasonably safe. Secondly, he must know beyond question that his machine, and particularly his motor, are absolutely in trim. Thirdly, he should endeavour to acquaint himself—although, naturally, this is not always feasible—with the characteristics, and possible landing-places, of the country over which he intends to fly. These safeguards, when specified, seem to verge upon the obvious. But, as a truism tells us, it is just such precautions which are apt to be ignored; and in flying, more than in any other science or sport,

it is an inclination to take things for granted which brings the deadliest risks in its train.

When studying the temperament of the aviator, one forms the conclusion, indeed, that carelessness is likely to prove the most perilous of his potential faults. It cannot be condoned, either in the man who flies, or—for the matter of fact—on the part of the manufacturer who may build his craft. Upon the latter, truly, there rests a heavy burden of responsibility. The breaking of one faulty spar, when a machine is aloft, may involve it in immediate disaster.

He who is ill-balanced, mentally, may pass muster in the less exacting tasks of life, and even distinguish himself in some; but, in airmanship, he represents a ceaseless menace. Excitability, or impulsiveness, need to be excluded rigorously from the mentality of any man who is to control aircraft.

The ideal type—the pilot who has no misgivings, being entirely master of himself—is cool, collected, and painstaking; and, should need come, he is quick both in decision and action. Such a man is—by the perfection of his method—economical of energy; and, unless he is the victim of a mishap which no amount of foresight could avoid, he may fly constantly, and with credit, and yet with a minimum deterioration either of physique or nerve.

An airman who is experienced has, during the course of his training, so schooled certain functions of his brain that they act more speedily than do those of ordinary men; and this point has significance. It tells us, for instance, that a pilot should be at concert pitch, physically and mentally, before he essays to fly. It is vital, indeed, that one should, when piloting an aeroplane be absolutely fit in every way; and it is a fact that I, for one, thoroughly appreciate. Hence, when not feeling "up to the mark," I make it an unbroken rule to remain on the ground.

It was a subsequently famous pilot who said, after his first attempt to handle an aeroplane, that flying struck him as being like trying to steady a motor-car which was side-slipping, viciously, all ways at once. But, day by day, as his tuition proceeds, the airman's brain becomes "educated" to the work of sending lightning messages to his limbs. The actions of controlling an aircraft need—between the brain, and the hands

and feet—a co-operation more rapid and instinctive than has ever before been demanded from them. But man's adaptability in undertaking new tasks is demonstrated, very conclusively, by the fact that large batches of pupils, representing all mental types, are learning to fly—without difficulty or mishap—at the aviation schools now in operation.

IV

And so one reaches a question which is, really, the crux of the problem: "Does flying, or does it not, represent an intolerable strain upon men of average capacity?"

The direct answer, which in my view should be "no," needs qualification. One airman, for instance, can remain aloft, uninterruptedly, for more than thirteen hours, and alight none the worse for the prolonged flight; but another, who is equally skilled, may descend exhausted, after less than an hour in the air. The explanation is that atmospheric conditions are, in the first instance, favourable; while, in the second, the pilot is fighting ceaselessly against adverse weather. Herein lies the qualification, and it may be framed thus: while the manœuvring of an aeroplane, under favourable circumstances, represents no more of an ordeal, either mental or physical, than its pilot can bear quite well, there are abnormal conditions—arising chiefly through treacherous winds—which entail a strain, both mental and physical, that may admittedly become acute. The point, therefore, resolves itself finally to this: practically any man may fly safely, in suitable weather, and the ease of doing so will dispel all fear from his mind; but—at any rate in the present stage of aeroplane development—it needs a pilot of exceptional nerve and endurance to battle with high and gusty winds.

In the future, when we reach the commercial stage of flight, the handling of aeroplanes—owing to their perfection in stability and control—will be even simpler than it is to-day. Hence the world can rest assured that—when the aerial era actually dawns—the purely human element will be quite equal to the strain of steering large, fast-flying, passenger craft.

Claude Grahame-White.

AMERICAN AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON.

On the results of the session of Congress that began on April 7 will rest the fate of the Democratic Party for many years to come. President Wilson called Congress in extraordinary session primarily to revise the tariff. That was a mandate from the country. The high cost of living was one of the great issues in the last campaign, and the Democrats pledged themselves if given the power they would so reduce duties on the necessaries of life that expenses would be measurably decreased. The people took them at their word. A Democratic President and a Democratic majority in both Houses of Congress now must either make their promise good or else admit they were insincere.

The attempt is to be made. Whatever the outcome they cannot be accused of insincerity or not endeavouring loyally to live up to their bargain. Under the direction of Representative Underwood, the Ways and Means Committee, of which he is the competent chairman, has drafted a Bill to supersede the existing Payne-Aldrich law, and President Wilson has been freely consulted by Mr. Underwood and his associates so that there may be complete accord between Congress and the President. The Bill now under consideration makes heavy reductions in nearly every schedule, and greatly enlarges the free list, but whether the public will gain to the extent it has believed would follow the repeal of high protection, remains to be seen.

Whether the full amount of the duty is added to the cost to the consumer is the controversy that has always raged between the Protectionist and the Free Trader. Take a single article as a concrete illustration. Some of the ardent tariff reductionists have advocated free wool on the ground that wool is an article of

prime necessity, that the poor man can no more live in comfort without wool in some of its forms than the rich man, that the duties are excessive, and that their burden presses heaviest upon the poor man. In this country a very fair suit of clothes can be bought ready made for twenty-five dollars. That is the price the middle-class man pays, not the working man as a rule, or the man to whom a few dollars more or less make no difference, but men of moderate means who buy one suit a season. A twenty-five dollar suit in the United States bought over the counter in a large shop is not as good in material or workmanship as the equivalent five pound suit made to order by a reputable tailor in England; it will not last as long nor will it keep its shape or look as smart in a few months; but that is what the average middle-class American wears and must be satisfied with. In such a suit there is about nine and a half pounds of wool, and on this the present duty is a dollar and five cents, say roughly a fraction over four shillings. If the duty were abated and the consumer obtained the full benefit he would be the better off by four shillings; that is, instead of paying as now the customany twenty-five dollars, he would pay twenty-four dollars. This of course assumes that the manufacturer of clothing, the wholesale merchant and the retailer, would give the full benefit of the saving to the consumer, which is not likely. He might profit by a part of it, but not the whole. The *maximum* saving by free wool would be a dollar, and in all probability half of that would be absorbed in the intermediate processes of manufacturing and marketing, so that the consumer's net gain would be fifty cents, or 2 *per cent.* on the cost of the conventional twenty-five dollar suit of clothes. The saving would be so trifling that it would mean nothing.

This saving of two shillings on a five pound suit of clothes is at the expense of the American wool-grower, and while the consumer would save nothing, or so little that it would practically be nothing, the wool-grower, deprived of his protective duty, would be injured, some people assert he would be ruined; for the American manufacturer would buy foreign wool in preference to domestic if he could obtain it at the same price. The growing of wool by the American farmer is an important industry and gives employment to thousands of men; it means a great difference to the farmer whether his flock has a value simply as meat or as meat with the

fleece as a by-product. To the statesman making up the national balance sheet it would seem that he would consider long and carefully before writing down a saving of two shillings on a five pound suit of clothes as a fair set-off to the ruin of a great industry which is as old almost as creation, but to the free trade economist cheapness is the sole proof of wisdom.

But the cost of living reduced by 2 *per cent.* will satisfy no one. Taken in the aggregate, reductions of fifty cents or a dollar even on millions of suits of clothes and millions of other things are stupendous and imposing; distributed among the millions the individual saving is so beggarly that it will excite only derision. We have already been given one instance of this sort of tariff reduction. For years the Massachusetts manufacturers had been clamouring for free hides on the ground that the only beneficiary of the duty was the "Leather Trust," and the public was robbed by the duty. Yielding to the popular demand the framers of the Payne-Aldrich law put hides on the free list, but the public gained nothing. Immediately following the passage of the law certain grades of cheaper boots were advanced in price, and I do not find that any one pays less for his footwear now than formerly. The manufacturers, however, are probably better off by being able to buy cheaper leather. This is one of the problems that confronts the Democrats. If they could reduce the twenty-five dollar suit of clothes to fifteen dollars, the reduction would be great enough to convince every wearer of the wisdom of the Democratic policy, until he had to pay the bill, and then he might have doubts as to its wisdom. Not the farmer alone, but the manufacturer and the working man and the man who buys the suit of clothes would be, I believe, the sufferers. What the Democrats have promised is a reduction in the prices of commodities without any reduction in wages, seemingly an impossibility when we remember that high prices in America are one of the results of high wages, and high wages are possible because commodity prices are high. If the Democrats are able to reduce prices and leave wages untouched, every one will be satisfied, and their attempt to do this will be watched with the keenest interest.

The effect of the new tariff means a great deal to the welfare and prosperity of the country and everything to the Democrats.

It is twenty years since the last Democratic tariff was placed on the statute books, and what followed is still bitterly remembered. Opinions differ as to whether the disastrous times that were the sequel of that Bill were the consequence of that legislation or were due to other causes, and as it is a question that cannot be satisfactorily determined it is not necessary for me to attempt to ascertain the truth. But if again the same thing should happen, if the passage of the Democratic tariff law brings about a panic, or cuts down employment or diminishes wages, that will be the last of Democratic tariff revision for a great many years to come. The people were persuaded to allow the Democrats to try the experiment because of the belief that it could be done successfully, and they were in a mood to believe that on the tariff could be piled all the evils of which they complained, but the American people, I am convinced, are not content to buy cheap prices at the cost of low wages. They want things cheap and wages high, and we shall see whether it is possible for the Democrats to work the economic miracle.

What effect the new tariff will have on British exports it is as yet too early to be able to determine, but seemingly it should stimulate them and provide a larger market for textiles, both cotton and wool. Some of the American manufacturers of those articles are pessimistic and see only ruin facing them; domestic industries, they say, are to be sacrificed for the benefit of the foreigner; the Bill is really in the interest of Europe and Americans will have to pay the bill. It is expected that the new law will not go into effect until late in summer, so that full opportunity will be afforded while the debate is in progress in both Houses for all the facts to be brought out and the dangers, if they are real, to be exposed. The President and his supporters in Congress hope that the Bill will not be amended in any substantial particular, and while it will probably pass the House in the form in which it was introduced, its passage through the Senate will encounter greater opposition. One thing is made apparent by the Bill, and that is the wisdom of Mr. Borden and his Party in rejecting the Taft offer of reciprocity. What Canada would have been forced to buy at a heavy price is now hers for nothing, and if reciprocity is as greatly for the benefit of Canada as it was proclaimed to be she will secure all the advantage without having delivered herself

bound to the United States and imperilled her economic independence.

Mr. Wilson has been in office too short a time to prognosticate his future, but long enough to give a very clear idea of his motives, his methods and his mentality. In a few weeks he has made a profound impression upon the country, for here is a new kind of President, a man who comes to the Presidency with a different concept of his duties, his responsibilities and his privileges from his predecessors, who has brought a new atmosphere into the White House. According to popular opinion—the least reliable and the most fleeting of judgments, and almost invariably always wrong—with the accession of Mr. Roosevelt to the Presidency there began a new era in American politics. For the sake of convenience public opinion in this case may be regarded as correct. Mr. Roosevelt set the pace. He defied traditions and established precedents of his own. He loved the spectacular. He made the Presidency dominant in American politics. His attempt was to make Congress subservient to the President, but he had neither tact to be a successful diplomat nor sufficient " stick " to map out a programme or policy and adhere to it against all allurements or opposition. His mind was too vivid; it could be too easily distracted. Typical of this is the way he evaded tariff revision. He came into the White House determined to revise the tariff and believing that the people insisted upon it. Economics were neither in Mr. Roosevelt's line nor did they make a powerful appeal; schedules were fleshless and bloodless things; while social questions pulsed with humanity. But the tariff was a burning question, and he felt he must take it up. The Republican leaders, Senator Aldrich, Speaker Canon and the rest of them, persuaded him that it was bad policy and the wisest thing was to leave the tariff alone, and he yielded to their persuasion. This does not reflect upon Mr. Roosevelt's courage, although it may be a reflection upon his judgment; it does show, however, that he was amenable to argument and was willing to subordinate his will to the advice of men who had their own purpose to serve.

Mr. Taft belonged to the past rather than the new era. Coming after Mr. Roosevelt it was expected that he would continue not only the Roosevelt " policies "—policies that were never defined

or concretely expressed or reduced to a practical working basis—but also the Roosevelt methods, which he could not do because of temperamental idiosyncrasies. Mr. Roosevelt believed in the autocracy of the Presidency, Mr. Taft did not. Mr. Roosevelt believed that Congress must do what the President directed, and if it did not Congress could be coerced; Mr. Taft respected the independence of Congress, but insisted upon the President maintaining his own independence and resisting the attempted coercion of Congress. Mr. Roosevelt held that an executive officer might do anything that the law did not expressly forbid; Mr. Taft was governed by the principle that an executive officer might do only those things for which there was express sanction in law. Mr. Roosevelt delighted in the unusual and nothing gave him greater pleasure than to do things that would make him talked about; Mr. Taft had no love of the theatrical, and was indifferent to public approval not founded on solid achievement.

Now comes Mr. Wilson, who comes at a time when the people want neither a second Roosevelt nor a second Taft, but who want a combination of both with an added element. What that element is they are unable to define, but they know it must be there if the administration is to realise expectations and be a success. Perhaps the ordinary man in his rough and ready way of reaching a conclusion without going through the laborious intermediate process of scientific analysis would say: "Mr. Roosevelt tried to do too much and did too little, and Mr. Taft was content not to attempt too much and did not enough." That perhaps is as near as the ordinary man could express himself. It was characteristic of Mr. Roosevelt that he enjoyed "stirring things up," and that at first was amusing, but later the people were surfeited with excitement and longed for a quieter life. Mr. Taft, on the other hand, kept the pool stagnant—or the people got the impression that he did, which amounts to the same thing in the end—and then they wanted fresh excitement.

Mr. Wilson's opening weeks in the Presidency have not been dull. He has given the country much to talk about, but he has alarmed no one. He has already violated more traditions and ignored more precedents than any of his predecessors in their full term, but no apprehension has been caused. It is not so

much what a man does as the way he does it that makes a thing either sensational or only part of the day's work. Twenty-four hours after Mr. Wilson had been in the White House, a custom that was coeval with the Republic had been thrown into the scrap heap. Day after day, for weary weeks and months, the newly inaugurated President was compelled hour after hour to listen to the demands and pleas for office. A greater part of his time was taken up in listening to senators and representatives who wanted this man appointed to some petty place or who opposed his appointment and presented the name of a rival; to receiving delegations who urged candidates or had reasons to give why their names should not receive consideration; to reading letters and memorials, all either urging appointments or vehemently protesting. No President pretended he enjoyed this, but he did not see how he could escape it. It was the price he paid for office. Men must be appointed, and only the President could decide their claims. Time and energy that should have been reserved for serious matters of state were dissipated because the President must decide whether this man or that should be postmaster at some insignificant place. Presidents grew restive and physically and mentally suffered (the elder Harrison died a month after reaching the White House, his system broken down by the importunities of the office seekers), but no President had the courage or the wisdom to see that the relief was in his own hands.

Mr. Wilson simply notified the office seekers and their patrons that he would give no time to them, and that it would be useless for them to come to the White House. They must make their applications to the members of the Cabinet under whom they hoped to serve, and in turn the Cabinet would make their recommendations to the President, who, of course, would be the final arbiter. Naturally the office seekers were stunned and indignant —what was the use of having won a glorious victory if they were not to be the beneficiaries of the spoils?—and the country was somewhat amazed; but it found cynical enjoyment in the discomfiture of the place-hunting brigade and enthusiastically approved the President's good sense. One reason perhaps why the country acquiesced in Mr. Wilson's action was the manner in which it was done. It is the habit of nearly all American public

men to send up trial balloons to test public sentiment before irrevocably committing themselves, and they put out "feelers" through the newspapers, which enables them to fight or flee as wisdom may dictate. This is a mistake. The more a thing is discussed the more reasons can be found for criticism and the dangers of attempting it, when it becomes an accomplished fact discussion ceases because it is a waste of time to flog a dead horse. Had Mr. Wilson given a hint of what he proposed to do, doubtless the newspapers would have offered him much valueless advice and some of the party leaders would have feared the consequences and warned him not to risk antagonising the rank and file thus early. Mr. Wilson said nothing. His official announcement was all that he considered necessary.

This gives an insight into his character. It reveals at once the qualities of courage, decision, and quick comprehension; it shows him a man so confident of himself that he need not care whether everything he does meets public approval or arouses hostility. After having issued his order the President did not think it required to be explained; neither directly nor through the convenient medium of unofficial "friends" did he give his reasons or seek to exploit his reform. Having in a quite unemotional way done what he knew to be requisite, he turned to other matters, and the public took it as a matter of course that the President had a more profitable use for his time than to waste it by listening to the appeals of office seekers.

One might gather from this that President Wilson is a secretive man who keeps himself aloof from the people. Before he was inaugurated he announced his door would stand open, and anyone who had legitimate business would not find it difficult to reach him, and the newspapers waxed facetious as they pictured the great American public, which is not noted for its reticence or effacement, strolling into the President's room, making itself quite at home, interrupting a Cabinet Council or a Conference with an Ambassador. Mr. Wilson, the newspapers said, meant well, but he would modify his ideas of conducting the Government after reaching Washington.

Even the most exclusive Presidents have been easy of access as compared with the European ruler or a high functionary hedged

about by doors and guards. It has not been difficult for anyone having business with the President to see him; the casual visitor who merely desired to "pay his respects" found the way reasonably open. Naturally not every one could walk in on the President unannounced, and his secretaries tried to save him as much as possible, but Mr. Wilson, since he has been in the White House, has lived up to his pre-inauguration declaration. There was never a time when there has been so little formality at the White House, or when its occupant could be so readily reached, and curiously enough this privilege has facilitated the transaction of business and thus far led to no abuse.

The President's visitors are sifted through his Secretary, who makes the President's engagements and watches the list to see they are kept and no person overstays his allotted time. Many persons who would like to see the President must go away disappointed; he is either too busy to see them at the time or the Secretary can dispose of them without troubling the President, but the limit is stretched to the utmost, and the President is very good about receiving visitors.

Prior to the present régime, when one wanted to see the Secretary to the President (which is the official title) a card was sent to him through his doorkeeper. The Secretary to the President occupies an important and unique position; he combines the functions of the King's private secretary with those of the principal private secretary of the Prime Minister and his parliamentary secretary; and ranks almost with a member of the Cabinet, and, in a way, is of more consequence than some of the Cabinet posts. The President must trust implicitly not only in his Secretary's loyalty but in his tact, judgment, and discretion, for no matter how devoted he may be to the President's interests, if he has not tact, judgment, and discretion he can do the President incredible harm, as more than one President has discovered to his cost by having selected the wrong man. The relation between the President and members of the Cabinet is seldom as close as that between him and his Secretary when the proper relation exists: a member of the Cabinet may know only the work of his own department unless some matter relating to another department causes it to become a cabinet question or a matter of policy is to be discussed; the Secretary has his finger on every department, as

all communications between the heads of departments and the President pass through the hands of the Secretary. Incidentally it may be added that two Secretaries in my time became Cabinet Ministers. Mr. Lamont was Mr. Cleveland's Secretary in his first administration, and in his second was his Secretary of War. Mr. Cortelyou was appointed by Mr. McKinley his Secretary, and was made by Mr. Roosevelt Secretary of Commerce and Labour, then Postmaster-General and then Secretary of the Treasury. Curiously enough, Mr. Cortelyou, as I now recall, is the only American to have held three portfolios under the same President.

The Secretary to the President is naturally a very busy man and his time is fully occupied during his official hours. His principal callers are politicians, who come to consult the President about legislation or party matters and to make suggestions or ask for his advice, and newspaper men seeking information. Of the latter there are some two hundred regularly accredited and representing American newspapers in all parts of the country, the Press agencies, and a few foreign newspapers. The entire corps of correspondents does not go to the White House every day, for many of its members specialise, but a large number make a daily call, as it is necessary for the correspondents to keep in close touch with the President through his Secretary, especially if they represent newspapers of his political faith. When President Wilson was Governor of New Jersey his attention was attracted to a keen, alert young lawyer, a member of the legislature, who had fearlessly opposed certain vicious legislation and with much force and earnestness championed legislation that was in the public interest. This young lawyer, Mr. Joseph P. Tumulty, acted as Governor Wilson's Secretary prior to his nomination and after his election, and the President was so well satisfied with his ability that he offered him the Secretaryship. After being in Washington only a few days Mr. Tumulty took a step as radical as that of his chief in refusing to see office seekers. There was no reason, he said, why members of the Press should have to send their cards to him or make an appointment, his door would always be open to them, and all they had to do was to walk in.

To a foreigner familiar with the European formality of approaching officialdom, this seemed too democratic to be dignified, and a great many Americans, those especially with a long Washing-

ton experience, were certain that after the open door policy had been tried for a week or two it would be abandoned, as Mr. Tumulty's entire time would be taken up in seeing pressmen, and he would have no opportunity to attend to anything else. So far the experiment has worked admirably. Knowing that the door is open to them, men do not pass through it unless they have a legitimate errand, and Mr. Tumulty has a happy faculty for disposing of would-be lingering callers without giving offence. Instead of the Secretary's office being crowded, as it used to be, now there are only a few persons, who in turn are received by the Secretary or taken to the President.

A short passage connects the Secretary's office with the President's. The doors between the two rooms are kept open, and standing in the Secretary's office one can look into the President's room, but the President's desk is so placed that when he is sitting at it he cannot be seen. Frequently, however, during the course of the morning the President gets up from his desk and moves about the room, and this he does when he wants to bring an interview to a close. The average person who calls on the President is in no hurry to leave, and the less important his errand the longer he takes to explain it. President Wilson listens patiently, although perhaps with little enjoyment, then he gets up and moves toward the door, and it must be a very obtuse person who cannot take the hint; and if something more than a hint is needed then the President shakes hands with him, but it is done graciously and in a way that is flattering to the person who without knowing it is being dismissed; as if the President was really pained to think that his visitor's engagements were so pressing that he had to rush away. Occasionally the President goes to the Secretary's office and meets people who have no business with him but want to go back home and say they were received by the President. They are sent away rejoicing with a handclasp and a word or two, the little ceremony is over in less than a minute and the President is back in his office.

Mr. Wilson despatches business with more celerity than either Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Taft. The former knew how to economise time and could dispose of the casual caller in short order, but Mr. Roosevelt often became so interested in a visitor he forgot that others were still to come, and very often while he was being

shaved in a small room attached to his private office, he would be talking vigorously to the last man on his appointment list of that morning. Mr. Taft was leisurely; he seldom cut short the flow of eloquence, and as a result his schedule was almost invariably far behind. The change, the freedom, the absence of informality is decidedly interesting to the student of manners and customs, and it will be curious to observe whether a Democratic President is really more " democratic " than a Republican, or whether this is merely a passing phase or a permanent return to that " Jeffersonian simplicity " of which we have all heard so much.

The opinion expressed some time ago that if Mr. Bryce remained in Washington until a settlement was reached in the Panama Canal tolls controversy (which it was intimated he intended to do) Sir Cecil Spring-Rice would be an Ambassador without a post indefinitely is now proved to be correct. Mr. Bryce is leaving about the end of the month and Panama will be a legacy to his successor. President Wilson, I am informed on excellent authority, believes it to be wise not to press the matter at the present session of Congress, but to postpone action until the regular session next December. Undoubtedly this is good policy from the President's standpoint, and as ships will not pass through the canal until next year, no damage will be done to British interests by the delay. Congress during the present session will be so busily occupied with the tariff that it will have neither time nor be in a mood to take up anything else, and to try to force action now might do more harm than good.

A. Maurice Low.

UNIONISTS AND SOCIAL FACTS

WHAT I am about to say in the following few pages, though it has a direct bearing on the attitude of the Unionist or Conservative Party, and on that indeed of all moderate minded men, has no bearing on the merits of any particular policy, or the details of any party programme. Moreover, the questions in view are practically of one kind only, namely such as relate to social, as distinct from general, politics.

All party conflicts are carried on by means of logical arguments in support of specified proposals on the one hand, and of allegations as to actual facts on the other. With regard to social politics this is true to a conspicuous degree, the alleged facts—or the data without which there would be no controversy at all—constituting, so far as the more extreme reformers are concerned, the most important part of their case, or at all events the most distinctive; and the point to which I here desire to draw attention is that the Moderate Party, in opposing such extremists, is too apt to content itself with attacking the proposals of its opponents and the logic by which they are supported, accepting the facts very much as these opponents state them: whereas the proper course would be to attack the facts first; which being done, the proposals in their crude form would, more often than not, fall to pieces of themselves.

My meaning shall be explained by certain simple but remarkable illustrations.

There are few extreme proposals which, when they were in the proposal form, have been attacked more vehemently by the Unionist Party than Mr. Lloyd George's proposals to lay special taxes on land—especially those relating to the "unearned increment." The Unionists urged—and in this respect they were fully equal to the occasion—that all property is liable to fluctuations in value, from pictures and old engravings up to Marconi shares; that unearned increments (just like undeserved decrements) were a general phenomenon, and not peculiar to land; and that to single out for vindictive fiscal proscription one kind of property out of many, was at once obviously unjust, and dangerous to all security. But for these arguments Mr. George and his supporters

had an answer of a rough-and-ready kind—and it was the only answer made by them—which was effective in proportion as it was believed. It was an answer which based itself not on logic, but on alleged facts. The "unearned increment" exhibited by land values was, it was said, a fit subject for special taxation because its amount was so enormous, and because year by year it became more enormous still. Not to dwell on the fact that the Ministerial Press backed up the Chancellor of the Exchequer by asserting that the entire ground-rent of London went virtually into the pockets of eight landlords (the actually identified number having been more than 34,000), it may be mentioned that Mr. Asquith, speaking in the House of Commons, assisted his colleague by declaring that the soil of the Metropolitan area alone showed a yearly increase in value (he put it at £1,000,000) which was, as a matter of fact, greater by at least 20 per cent. than the increment exhibited by the whole of the United Kingdom. If it had not been for the successful promulgation of statements such as these—monstrous in any case, and specially monstrous as emanating from a Prime Minister—Mr. George's increment tax would have been rejected as an absurdity from the first. But the Unionist Party as a whole were content to take these statements "lying down." When Mr. Asquith, for example, made the specific assertion just quoted, not a single voice in the House of Commons was raised to challenge it.

As illustrating the situation in a wider way, two occasions may be mentioned on which the question of the remuneration of labour, and the duty of the Government to increase it by legislative means, has been formally raised in Parliament by members of the Labour Party. The first of these incidents occurred in July 1910; the second, not long ago, in connection with the opening of the present Parliamentary session. On both occasions one of the principal speakers was Mr. Snowden, and he based his position on certain alleged facts, which he put forward with confidence, as though they admitted of no dispute. On the first of these occasions he gave the exact amount of what he called "the income of the rich," commenting on its recent increase; and he then proceeded to represent the income of the poor as having, in terms of money, only increased slightly, whilst owing to the rise of prices its purchasing power had actually declined. Moreover, he said in conclusion, not only was this the case then, but it always had been

the case, and always must be the case, so long as our present industrial system lasts; the reason being that "as trade expands, the prices of necessaries rise, and money wages, even if they do not fall, never rise in the same proportion; in consequence of which, as the income of the nation increases, the wages of labour, in respect of their purchasing power, if not in nominal amount, grow constantly less and less." On the second of the two occasions referred to Mr. Snowden told much the same story, dealing more particularly with the earnings of the lower grades of labour, and urging, in conjunction with his colleagues, that the least the Government could do was to establish a minimum wage of 30*s*. a week for every adult employee.

Now on both these occasions, according to the newspaper accounts, the House, irrespective of party, accorded Mr. Snowden a very sympathetic hearing, recognising his sincerity, and also his self-restraint. If a doctor, however, is invited to deal with a sick man, it is not enough that he should be sincere in his diagnosis. The main point is that he should be accurate. Facts, no doubt, are in accordance with Mr. Snowden's statements so far that the rich are richer than the poor (for otherwise they would not be rich), and that prices have risen of late to a degree which is at all events very serious. But apart from these generalities, every one of his statements was incorrect, and their incorrectness was in proportion to the importance of the facts referred to. Not only did he obviously exaggerate the recent rise in prices, not only was he gravely in error with regard to so simple a question as the percentage of men in the cotton trade earning less than a certain sum, but with regard to the two most important propositions advanced by him, his inaccuracies were so wild as to have, except for purposes of agitation, no connection with realities whatsoever. Thus the sum which he quoted as representing the aggregate income of the "rich," by which he meant all persons with more than £160 a year, was what is technically known as "the gross amount reviewed for income-tax purposes;"* and it was by contrasting this total with the total wages of labour that Mr. Snowden aimed at producing one of his main effects. But this "gross amount reviewed" is something widely different from the aggregate of net incomes exceeding £160. It amounted, when Mr. Snowden spoke, to about a thousand millions, but at least one-fifth of this, *i.e.*

£200,000,000—was income coming into this country from abroad, the labour involved in the production of which was foreign labour, and it was therefore not comparable to the wages of British labour at all. In the second place, the "gross amount" comprised something like £70,000,000, going to persons whose incomes did not exceed £160, and to charitable bodies. In the third place, to say nothing of a large amount of over-assessments, it comprised the cost of maintaining or renewing all the factory buildings, all the machinery, and all the farms, business premises, and private houses in the kingdom, for which the statutory allowances alone amounted to more than £60,000,000, whilst the actual cost was more nearly £180,000,000. All these sums Mr. Snowden represented as income which was spent by the "rich" on their own enjoyments, on costly wines, for example, to take his own illustration—and was properly comparable in its totality to the wage-bill of the United Kingdom. It is not too much to say that, purely for the purposes of agitation, in dealing with a "gross amount" of about £1,000,000,000, he misrepresented the facts to the extent of some £460,000,000.

The second of his two cardinal statements was no less fallacious—that is to say his statement that, in proportion as the income of the country increases not only do the prices of necessaries always rise, but they always rise faster than wages, thus leaving the wage-earners continually poorer and poorer. If we examine the course of wages and prices for forty-seven years from the year 1850 onwards (as shown in Blue-book Cd. 4679 of 1909) we shall find that Mr. Snowden's statement of what "always happens" was verified by the events of one short period only—namely the few years affected by the Crimean War. Wages rose, but the rise in prices was greater, and the precise result described by Mr. Snowden appears to have been realised. But apart from these few years, not only did what he described as "always happening" fail to happen, but what happened was the exact reverse of it. Whenever prices rose the rise of wages was greater, whenever prices fell the fall in wages was less, the result being that from the year 1856 to the year 1896 or 1897, the rise of wages in terms of purchasing power was continuous.

It is not possible here to go into details further. The practical point to which I wish to draw attention is that the latter of these two monstrous misstatements was allowed to pass without protest

from anybody; whilst the former, namely th[illegible] as to the aggregate income of "the rich," was subjected to criticism by one person only, and that person was not a Unionist, but Mr. Hobhouse—a Member of the Liberal Government. Mr. Hobhouse however contented himself with saying that the honourable member was wrong to the extent of some 30 per cent., but that he (Mr. Hobhouse) had not got the true figures very clearly in his head at the moment.

Let us now take another question which bulks large in contemporary discussion, namely the movement which is called "the rural depopulation of Great Britain." This is a favourite theme, with radical and other extremists. Their general contention is that ever since the beginning of the nineteenth century the agricultural population of Great Britain has been declining, and that nothing is now left but a remnant. The truth of the matter is that, whereas the agriculturists (*i.e.* the actual workers) numbered about 1,448,000 in the year 1801, they number to-day about 1,600,000. There has been a decline in the number of this body, it is true. It is, however, a decline which dates, not from the beginning of the nineteenth century, but from the middle of it—that is to say from the epoch of the triumph of Free Trade principles. And the same holds good of Scotland—notably of the Highland counties. But not only do moderate men not question the data of their opponents; they have actually allowed themselves to be, as it were, hypnotised into accepting them. A very temperate writer, for example, a Member of Parliament, discussing the question in the *Nineteenth Century* for April 1913, though he has evidently as to many points made careful inquiries, takes the Radical story of rural depopulation as indubitable, and indeed somewhat improves on it. The depopulating process, he says, has been going on for nearly two centuries, and of our agricultural population as it once was, only "a scanty remnant now remains."

The above illustrations are sufficient as a foundation for the moral which I here desire to draw, namely that if the Unionist Party, or the moderates (even though many of them may call themselves Liberals), are to meet the proposals of the extremists either by a negative criticism which shall expose their errors, or by a rival policy of construction which shall supersede them, an equipment is necessary for them in respect of which they are at

present, as a party, deficient. ***This is an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the actual social conditions as they are, and as they have been in the comparatively recent past.*** Their opponents, in this respect, have at present very greatly the advantage of them. They have provided themselves with an arsenal of alleged facts covering the whole social field, of which they make use on every possible occasion, whether at Limehouse or elsewhere. For them this achievement is easy, for they care little whether their facts are right or wrong so long as they assist them in producing a desired impression. On the other hand the task of bringing false facts into discredit, by building up an opposing structure of true facts, is laborious in the extreme. It involves not only a minute examination of this or that series of Official Tables relating to a particular time, but also a collation of figures which are, in the official volumes, not even in juxtaposition, but are scattered through volumes of widely different dates, and which, until they are collated, disclose little of their true significance.

It is impossible for the majority of active politicians to perform such work for themselves. It is no less a matter of necessity for them, if they are as a body to deal with social questions adequately, to be equipped with information which such work alone can secure.

The Editor of the *National Review* has here given me the opportunity of bringing to the notice of his readers what I have myself been doing, and am doing still, with a view to meeting the requirements of the situation in this respect—namely, providing the practical politician and man of affairs with the requisite kinds of information in forms ready for immediate use. This is being done by the production and periodical issue (at the rate of about two a month) of short statistical monographs, each relating to some subject of current controversy, such as the distribution of landed properties, the actual average amount of the annual increment of land-values during specified periods, the actual net land-rent of the United Kingdom after payment of landlords' outgoings, as shown by the latest official figures, the ratio of profits to wages in the principal industries of the country, &c.

In each of these monographs the latest, and in many cases the earliest evidence available, is condensed and tabulated in such a way that any intelligent reader may master at a sitting the main facts of the subject dealt with, and in each case the authorities are

so indicated that any speaker may, if challenged, defend any figures quoted by him or, if necessary, verify them for himself.

A number of these monographs constitute special series, such as the Land series, dealing with various aspects of the land question as above indicated; a Wages and Profits series, embodying much information which has only just become accessible, which specially refutes the current exaggeration of agitators, and which also bears directly on the question of the Minimum Wage; a Census series, summarising the main results of the Reports on the Census of 1911, which are now in course of publication; a series consisting of Digests of the Income-tax Returns, in which these voluminous and complicated documents are simplified, and much information is given which, until the official Tables are re-analysed, altogether escapes observation, *e.g.* the number of companies, classified according to the amount of their respective earnings, the increase from period to period of the larger companies and the smaller; the respective totals, so far as they can be identified, of incomes exceeding and not exceeding £800 a year, the increase of income from lands and houses going to persons whose total incomes do not exceed £160, &c.

I may specially mention also that a monograph is now in preparation which will give definite information with regard to the number of the agricultural population of England and Wales in the years 1801, 1811, 1831, and 1851, so that reliable comparisons may be made in connection with the question of rural depopulation.

These monographs are all inter-related, so that reference may be made from one to the other, and the whole constitute a storehouse of coherent knowledge. The number of monographs issued last year was thirty. The issues for the current year will comprise many of these corrected and brought up to date, whilst others will be altogether new, embodying information not before accessible. Valuable criticisms and suggestions have been received from business men in various parts of the country, which have enabled improvement and revision to be accomplished promptly, according as the scope and character of individual monographs have made such alterations desirable.

The monographs are issued from the Offices of the Liberty and Property Defence League, 25 Victoria Street, S.W.; and those interested in the matter can learn all particulars by communicating with the Secretary, Mr. F. Millar, at that address. W. H. MALLOCK.

A MARCONI ENQUIRY ON INVASION

IN these matters we must have an ample margin of safety. . . . In order to secure that margin, the force for Home Defence permanently maintained here, should be sufficient to cope with a foreign invasion of 70,000 men.—MR. ASQUITH IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, *July* 29, 1909.

EIGHT years have passed since Mr. Balfour, in a speech which was acclaimed by politicians as the voice of a god, announced that the Committee of Imperial Defence had studied the problem of invasion and decided that it could be disregarded. There were military critics of high standing who even at that time shook their heads over this pronouncement and pointed out that it was brought forward by the Government of the day as an excuse for reducing the British Army. Since 1905, however, the conditions have vitally changed, and, even assuming that what Mr. Balfour said in that year was based on sound premises and correctly deduced from them, it does not follow that his conclusions still hold good. Therefore it is, we are told, that a new Committee has been appointed by the Prime Minister to reconsider the question. Unfortunately there is only too much reason to fear that this Committee is meant to discharge a purely partisan rôle. Like that astonishing tribunal, the Marconi Committee, appointed for the purpose of pronouncing a predetermined verdict, the function of the Invasion Committee is to acquit the Government of the charge of neglecting the nation's safety. Both enquiries are to provide "eye-wash" for the British public.

The composition of the new Committee, is significant. The Government has been indicted in the House of Commons and the House of Lords. And therefore the incriminated authority is given an ample majority upon the Committee. The accused is to judge his own offence and pronounce

the verdict he wants. That is an extraordinary proposal. Yet, according to an answer given by Mr. Asquith in the House of Commons, the Invasion Committee will be thus constituted:

MINISTERS (10).
Mr. Asquith.
Mr. Lloyd George.
Lord Haldane.
Lord Morley.
Mr. McKenna.
Sir E. Grey.
Mr. L. Harcourt.
Colonel Seely.
Lord Crewe.
Mr. Churchill.

UNIONIST (1).
Mr. Balfour.

INDEPENDENT (1).
Lord Esher.

NAVAL OFFICERS (3)

Prince Louis of Battenberg (First Sea Lord).
Admiral of the Fleet Sir A. K. Wilson (Ex-First Sea Lord, author of memorandum proving invasion impossible).
Vice-Admiral Sir H. Jackson (Chief of the War Staff).

ARMY OFFICERS (3)

General Sir J. French (Chief of the Imperial General Staff).
Lieut.-Gen. Sir J. Grierson (commanding Eastern District).
Brig.-Gen. D. Henderson (Director of Military Training).

SECRETARY

Captain Hankey (Secretary of the Imperial Defence Committee).

There will be ten Radical Ministers—ten Radical politicians—out of a total of eighteen members, and not one of them can claim any special strategical knowledge. The naval officers are only three, and one of them, Admiral of the Fleet Sir A. K. Wilson, is the author of the famous memorandum, written in 1910, proving that invasion is impossible—a memorandum which, it must be added, has been severely criticised even by officers of his own service. The soldiers are three in number, all closely connected with the War Office. Not one single independent soldier or thinker appears among the members with the exception of Lord Esher. If this Committee were really meant for business and if it were intended to study the question seriously, men of the standing of Lord Roberts, Lord Percy, and Professor Spenser Wilkinson would have been invited to serve upon it. The reason why their aid has not been invoked is clear. They are not wanted there because their presence would endanger the Government's

majority, and make the investigation a genuine instead of a bogus one.

It is exceedingly difficult to understand Mr. Balfour's presence upon this packed Committee. But it is highly undesirable for two reasons. In the first place it puts the Unionist Party in an impossible position. The Opposition will be saddled with responsibility for the conclusions at which the Committee arrives and will be told that Mr. Balfour has concurred in them. It will be muzzled and silenced when, for the very safety of the nation, it should be free to speak out. It is not as though the Opposition were fairly represented on the enquiry. In relation to its numerical strength in the House of Commons it has a right to at least seven members. In the second place, as we have seen, Mr. Balfour has already committed himself to the view that invasion can be neglected, and by no stretch of the imagination can he be regarded as an expert. Thus twelve of the eighteen members are already bound by political necessities or previous utterances to the verdict which the Government wants. In these circumstances there is only too much reason to fear that as Lord Midleton has predicted, the Government instead of adapting the force to the emergency, will adapt the emergency to the force at its disposal. That is to say the Committee will meet the decline in our military strength by professing that no invading force of 70,000 men—the previously accepted standard—can reach our shores; that, as the British strength has diminished, the enemy will be so obliging as to reduce correspondingly the numbers of his invasionary expedition or to come without guns and land in scattered detachments.

Nor is this treating the Liberal Party with the slightest injustice. In its Press it has maintained the view that the duty of naval and military officers of the Admiralty and War Office is to the Liberal Government and not to the nation. When Admiral Prince Louis of Battenberg pointed out some weeks ago that the Navy alone could not protect this country from invasion, he was at once taken to task for speaking the truth and tartly told by the *Westminster Gazette* that "the spectacle of naval and military persons splashing about in the deep waters of national policy without any apparent control from their superiors is bewildering. . . . He will do wisely as a professional adviser to

the Crown to keep clear of these controversies." Whence it appears that the real experts are to be strictly "controlled" by their "superiors," the partisan Ministers, and are to express no opinions inconvenient to them. British strategy, in a word, is to be determined by attorneys and barristers with an eye to the House of Commons and votes rather than to the demands of the military situation.

What are those demands and what is the actual position of this country with reference to invasion? Two factors have been considered in the past. The first is the number of men which an enemy would need to overcome resistance in this country—supposing as has always been assumed, that the British expeditionary force was absent—and the transport which would be required to move this army. Lord Roberts in 1904 calculated that the minimum strength in which an enemy would attempt invasion would be with 70,000 trained European troops. The second factor is the capacity of the Navy to prevent a hostile force from crossing the sea. Here it is quite obvious that a supreme fleet, assured of its supremacy from the first hour of war, enormously preponderant in strength, capable of maintaining a close blockade of the German coast, could prevent the passage of anything more than a mere shipload of German troops by sea. But it is also obvious that a fleet which is not sure of its supremacy and which may be defeated or masked or contained by a vigorous enemy, would be able to exercise no such restraining power, and that, against such a fleet, an army, the size of which would only be conditioned by the available number of transports, might be moved from Germany to our shores. Not 70,000 men but 250,000 might compose the invading force in that case. The possible strength of the invaders would be indefinitely increased if Germany—as many strategists both in this country and in France expect—on the outbreak of war or before it, occupied the south of Holland and the north of Belgium, thus moving close up to the British coast, and abridging the distance of the sea voyage.

In view of the fact that an absolutely supreme Navy is a certain bar to invasion, those who look at invasion alone are perfectly right in contending that it can be prevented by strengthening the Fleet. But an omnipotent Navy can in no circumstances

guard the land frontiers of the Empire; and already we have land frontiers in contact with formidable military Powers, in Egypt and in India, not to mention Canada. True that, so long as the Triple Entente continues, the Indian frontier is not in any serious danger, while the fighting strength of Turkey, so far as can be judged from the late war, is not superior to our own on land. There is, however, another danger which threatens us. The enormous increase in German land armaments, at a time when the German navy is also being developed to the utmost, points to a determination on the Kaiser's part sooner or later to force Holland and Belgium within the German fold. For seven centuries England has fought to prevent a strong military and naval Power gaining control of the mouths of the Rhine and the Low Countries, because instinct has told her people that such control is equivalent to a sentence of lingering death upon her. If she is to avert this great catastrophe she must have an effective field army with an effective second line army behind it, as well as a great fleet. She is bound by treaty to protect Belgian independence. And because the destruction of France would be the certain preliminary to the seizure of the Low Countries by Germany, she is bound in self-interest, if not by definite compact, to go to the aid of France in Lorraine. Now the strongest navy in the world is useless in Lorraine or on the battlefields of Belgium. However victorious at sea it will never end a war or defeat a land army. On the other hand the possession of a strong first line army and an adequate and well-trained Territorial Force would equally prevent invasion, assure Britain the alliance of France and Russia, and bring their naval force into play, thus indirectly or directly strengthening the British Navy. It would also prove an effective deterrent of any German attack upon Belgium.

Thus the offhand argument that the right reply to threats of invasion is to strengthen the Fleet, is no longer true. It may have been correct ten or fifteen years before immense fleets were in the hands of our potential enemies. But to secure the absolute command of the sea against these potential enemies—three of the greatest Continental Powers—is a task which is growing beyond the capacity of this country. On the ratio of five battleships to each three of the hostile combination, a proportion declared necessary for a close blockade of an enemy's coast by

the three Admirals in their classic report on the naval manœuvres of 1888, Britain must provide by the close of 1916 a fleet of 65 "Dreadnoughts" instead of the total of 45,* which are actually built, building, or to be laid down for European service before the end of next year. That is to say, she must lay down not 6 but 16 "Dreadnoughts" this year, and not 4 but 14 next year. She must also provide crews to man them, docks to clean them and harbours to contain them. And this increase of 20 ships must be made after Mr. Churchill has proposed a "naval holiday" to Germany and promised her—for in Germany his words have been construed as a promise—not to exceed a certain, quite inadequate, standard of naval strength. Merely to state the facts in this form is to show the impracticability of the proposal to effect the increase in the Navy required. Without compulsory service the men could not be obtained; the officers do not exist and could not be trained in time; and the cost would be stupendous. Moreover the increase of 20 in our battleship strength must be accompanied by a corresponding increase in our cruiser, destroyer and submarine strength. The only practical course in such conditions is to follow the example which Germany has given, and enter a definite alliance with our Continental friends, thus pooling our liabilities. France and Russia will assuredly demand a substantial increase in our military strength, for even with that we and they shall be hard put to it to resist aggression. But the "blue water" plan is no plan at all, because it is impossible of execution.

In 1905 and 1910 invasion was studied from the naval standpoint by the British Admiralty. The results of the first investigation were given by Mr. Balfour in his famous speech of May 11, 1905. It was apparently assumed that the invading force in its transports would accompany the hostile fleet, an assumption for which there is no sound military argument. Everything points to the invasionary transports moving independently of the main hostile fleet, covered not by the actual presence of that fleet but by the attack which it is delivering upon the British defending naval force or forces. This has again and again been emphasised in this Review, and it has the support of modern naval history. The Japanese transports were not mixed

* The three Canadian ships are not included, as it is not yet certain that they will be laid down next year.

up with Togo's fleet in February 1904; they moved behind it while Togo was watching or attacking the Russian warships, leaving him free. Mr. Balfour in 1905 regarded it as possible that the British main fleets might be absent when invasion was essayed. But he concluded that because in addition to the main fleets, we then possessed 6 battleships, 6 large cruisers and 95 torpedo craft with nucleus crews, which could be mobilised in a few hours, besides 12 cruisers and 24 destroyers in permanent commission with full crews, no force of 70,000 men could land. He argued that such a force would require 210,000 to 250,000 tons of transport, which would be at the mercy of the British torpedo craft.

Let it be remembered, he said, no strength in battleships has the slightest effect in diminishing the number of hostile torpedo craft and submarines. A battleship can drive another battleship from the sea; it cannot drive a fast cruiser because a fast cruiser can always evade it. . . . Neither cruisers nor battleships can drive from the sea or coast . . . either submarines or torpedo destroyers, which have a safe shelter in neighbouring harbours and can infest the coast altogether out of reach of the battleship, which is very likely much more afraid of them than they have reason to be of her.

It will be observed that Mr. Balfour did not reckon upon the enemy's fleet taking any action. There was nothing whatever in the Far Eastern war to justify his confident assertions as to destroyers and submarines. The Japanese battleships and cruisers *did* force the Russian destroyers back into Vladivostock and Port Arthur. They *did* drive from the sea, sufficiently for their own purpose, the Russian torpedo craft, though these had a "safe shelter" in Port Arthur. But, as appeared from this war, a destroyer which is in a "safe shelter" cannot at the same time attack the hostile transports. This fact Mr. Balfour appears to have overlooked in 1905. Hence a conclusion based on such an evident misreading of naval history is worthless.

It is a curious fact, if submarines and torpedo craft do really possess these superlative merits, that no effort has been made or is being made to secure a decisive superiority in them against Germany. Official figures given by Mr. Churchill in the House of Commons this year show that 110 British destroyers were voted in 1906–12 and 72 completed to 84 German destroyers voted and 75 completed, so that Germany is actually ahead of this country in modern vessels of this type ready for sea. In submarines extreme secrecy is observed by both countries, but

it is known that since 1908 Germany has annually expended precisely the same sum on submarine construction as this country, so that in the very near future she will be equal in modern effective vessels of this class. So far as concerns destroyers in commission with full crews, Germany has 73 in the North Sea to a British total of 73, of which normally 15 are in the Channel or on the Irish coast. The British superiority in the North Sea is mythical and imaginary to-day whatever it was in 1905 when Mr. Balfour spoke.

Another of the calculations supplied by the Admiralty to Mr. Balfour has been sharply criticised. Far from accepting the conventional Ministerial view that an invading force of 70,000 men would require 250,000 tons of transport, Lieutenant Dewar concludes after a careful examination that 90,000 men could be moved to this country by 120,000 tons of shipping, which only means 24 ships of an average size of 5000 tons.* That number of vessels of the required size is at any moment to be found in the German North Sea ports. As for the disembarkation, the same critic thinks that it could be facilitated by the capture of one of our ill-defended East Coast ports, where the horses, artillery and waggons could easily be placed ashore. He has indeed painted a picture of the exact manner in which the seizure of such a port could be effected without overstraining the probabilities.

The Admiralty again examined the possibilities of invasion in 1910, and the result was Admiral Sir A. K. Wilson's memorandum of that year. It assumed that the admiral of a hostile fleet covering an invasion, "Will consider that somewhere within wireless call we have nearly double the number of battleships and cruisers that he can muster besides a swarm of destroyers." In actual fact the German strength in fully manned battleships is to be raised to 29 under the Navy Act of last year, while the British force in home waters will be identical, 29. Figures given by Mr. Churchill this year show that Britain voted 31 armoured ships and completed 18 between 1906 and 1912, while Germany voted 24 and completed 14, and from the British total deductions

* In the Italian expedition to Tripoli the allowance for each 1000 officers and men of infantry with their baggage was 1300 tons. Germany in 1905 possessed 144 merchant steamers of over 5000 tons: to-day she has 241.

must be made for the Mediterranean fleet. Admiral Wilson's idea that the British fleet in the North Sea is or will be to the German as two to one is, then, a mere delusion. And this is the more serious because he considered it possible that "part of our fleet may be enticed away by stratagem," in which case, of course, the British inferiority in force must be very pronounced. But he declared: "The other half in conjunction with destroyers and submarines would be quite sufficient to sink the greater part of his (the enemy's) transports, even if supported by the strongest fleet he could collect. The fleets would engage each other while the destroyers and submarines torpedoed the transports."

"The fleets" of large ships are to "engage each other." What will be the issue of such an engagement, in which a detachment of the British Fleet confronts the whole German High Sea fleet, and in which that detachment has not the support of its submarines and destroyers—for these latter *ex hypothesi* are busy destroying the enemy's transports? The large British ships will have to meet the attack of a superior artillery, of a superior number of large ships. They will also be assailed by the German destroyers and submarines—which are assumed by Admiral Wilson to have left the German transports to be destroyed—and we have only to refer to Mr. Balfour's speech to see that, on the Admiralty theory of 1905, they will be much more afraid of the submarines and destroyers than these torpedo craft will be afraid of them. In such conditions the total destruction of the British detachment seems certain. The German admiral will then be able to fling his whole force upon "the other half" of the British fleet, when it returns from its bootless expedition, and to destroy it in the same way. He will be able, that is to say, to secure the command of the sea and to land as many men as he likes.

As a matter of fact, the torpedoing of transports is not such a simple matter as might appear. In the Russo-Japanese War two torpedoes were fired at the Japanese transport *Sado Maru* both of which hit her and exploded. But, notwithstanding a heavy sea, she kept afloat and reached port. The German transports might be trusted to make at once for shallow water, and there they could not be destroyed by torpedoes. This plan was adopted by the Japanese when landing near Pitsewo. They took their transports close in shore, "where," in the words of the

British Official History, " even if the ships were sunk their upper works would remain above water."

Thus on close examination Admiral Wilson's arguments appear unsound, and we canot accept his assertion that " an invasion on even the moderate scale of 70,000 men is practically impossible." This—*absit omen*—was almost precisely the conclusion of the Chief of the Russian Naval Staff in the Far East on the eve of the war with Japan. In a report drawn up for the Tsar he wrote: " Our plan of operations should be based on the assumption that it is impossible for our fleet to be beaten, taking into consideration the present relationship between the two fleets, and that Japanese landings at Newchwang and in the Gulf of Korea are impracticable." Yet the " impossible " and the " impracticable " happened because the Russian fleet was badly disposed, surprised and never allowed to recover. One cause of its defective disposition was the insufficient dockyard and harbour accommodation in the Gulf of Korea, a condition which exists on the British north-east coast. The parallel is not altogether encouraging.

It is unnecessary to follow Admiral Wilson's memorandum further, though it contains other assumptions almost as surprising as those which have been examined. But whether because the arguments used by Admiral Wilson are now regarded as unsound, or because the strength of the British Navy in home waters relatively to Germany has so greatly declined, or because of the development of the new art of aviation, the British Admiralty has abandoned the view that the Navy alone can give an absolute guarantee against invasion. For twenty years the politicians of the Front Bench have played the Navy off against the Army. Such tactics have been rendered impossible in the future by Admiral Prince Louis of Battenberg's speech on April 21, when he said:

> There are people who go about saying: " if war comes the Fleet is quite enough to keep anybody from coming anywhere near the shores of this island kingdom." There can be no more foolish and mischievous statement. The Fleet alone could not do it, and the presence of a sufficient, trained, professional Army in this island at all times is quite as essential as the other arm of the Service.

In the past, when the preponderance of the British Navy over any other fleet was far greater than it is to-day, the Navy alone may have been able to give security against invasion, though

in the Napoleonic war this was by no means taken for granted. But with the passing of that preponderance and the enormous growth of German power by sea and land the situation has been transformed.

Moreover we cannot overlook the possibility that in the near future an enemy may be able to reach every part of our island through the air. In this element, Britain is already completely outdistanced. The British Admiralty and War Office do not possess between them a single large airship of the modern type and are not building any. They have in all two second class airships on order and three toy dirigibles complete. Of aeroplanes and hydroplanes they possess according to their own figures, 150, with perhaps another 100 under construction. The German air fleet already consists of 24 dirigibles, 10 of which are large enough to be capable of naval work in the North Sea. Another 10 or 12, all of the largest size, are believed to be under construction. Thus Germany, before Britain can complete a single large airship, will have more than 20 of her own. In aeroplanes and hydroplanes the German strength is estimated by French authorities at between 600 and 700, including a number of machines in private hands. Possibly this figure is exaggerated, but it is certain that the German strength in heavier-than-air flying machines is at least twice ours.

Even now in favourable weather isolated airships of the Zeppelin type can reach every part of Great Britain, as Captain von Pustau has boasted. They can spy out the position and strength of our fleets, ascertain the distribution of our military forces, attack with their bombs, explosives, and guns, our dockyards, fortresses, magazines, wireless stations, railway junctions and large towns, and thus play an important, if not a decisive rôle, in war. It should not be forgotten that a Greek airman in the Balkan War blew up a Turkish magazine at Nagara by dropping a bomb from an aeroplane. If Germany should seize the Dutch and Belgian coast, the action of her aeroplanes and hydroplanes would also become effective; in any case these machines are certain to be so improved in the very near future as to be capable of long-range flights and of carrying considerable numbers of men. An aeroplane has already flown with ten passengers, and an airman has made the journey from London to Cologne. One consequence of these developments is that, in the

absence of British aircraft in sufficient numbers to drive off German airships and aeroplanes, the movements of our fleets cannot be masked. Another is that guns and detachments of troops must be provided to protect the great armament works, powder factories and magazines, even when these are situated inland. The claims upon our land forces are very greatly increased, and large bodies of troops and a costly armament will be locked up in purely passive defence as the result of the criminal neglect of Ministers to provide an air force capable of holding its own or taking a vigorous offensive.

While the relative force of our Navy has shrunk, our land forces have fallen grievously in strength, and this though the fleets and land armies of our possible assailants have been enormously increased. Since 1905 the German navy has been more than doubled in strength, and 29 of its battleships instead of 16 are to be kept permanently mobilised in North Sea waters. Since 1905 the peace establishment of the German army has been raised from 610,000 men to 860,000. On the other hand the peace strength of the British Regular Army in this country has fallen from 156,000 in 1905, to 137,500 this year, a loss of nearly 20,000 men; and when Lord Haldane's disastrous "reforms" have done their work, the Army Reserve will be reduced by 40,000; the Militia and the Militia Reserve in 1905 mustered 103,000 men; the Special Reserve, which has taken their place, numbers only 62,000 to-day, a loss of 41,000 men. The Volunteers and Yeomanry numbered 272,000 in 1905; the strength of the Territorial Force which has taken their place is now 253,000, a loss of 19,000 men. Thus without counting the loss in the Army Reserve, our military forces at home have diminished by about 80,000 men in eight years, against an increase in the active service, fully trained German army of at least 250,000. And yet the report of the Royal Commission on the South African War issued in 1903 is there to prove that in that year our defences were altogether inadequate and unsatisfactory. We have gone backward while every other Continental Power has moved forward.

The landing of an invasionary force of 70,000 men or even a much larger force has been shown to be possible, because our weakened Navy is no longer certain of commanding the sea. In the absence of the expeditionary force which has always been

assumed—by Mr. Asquith in 1909 no less than by Mr. Balfour in 1905—and which might be caused by an upheaval in India or other complications, the duty of meeting the invader will have to be undertaken by the Territorial Force. Any fragments of the regular Army or Special Reserve that remain after the mobilisation of the "six strong divisions" for foreign service will be needed for garrison duty. The actual number of Territorials who last year underwent a training of fifteen days in camp and qualified in the very elementary musketry test imposed, was 160,000. It is admitted by Colonel Seely that these men cannot deal with an army of 70,000 invaders unless it comes without artillery and cavalry, and unless it lands in little detachments. So that Mr. Asquith's "ample margin of safety" has not been secured. Sir John French has distinctly warned the Territorials that they cannot be used in the field against a trained European army, unless they have received a training in war conditions. That training is not even to begin till war has broken out. The Territorial Force, in fact, is not an army but a sham—a sham intended to deceive the British nation. It is a mob of men with rifles and antiquated guns; without cohesion, without trained officers, worse in every respect than the Turkish redifs who bolted from Kirk Kilisse and caused the fall of a once great Empire. And it cannot be improved for reasons which Sir John French has pointed out—because the extent of its training and its numbers are limited by the necessities of voluntary service. A terrible awakening awaits the nation which ventures to pit men with a week's training against soldiers who spend two or three years of their life in military training of the most rigorous and intensive kind.

There is only one remedy and the Government knows it perfectly well. It is to require every able-bodied adult to serve in the Territorial Force when both the numbers and the training could be increased. But this is precisely the remedy which Ministers will not apply. Better catastrophe for the Empire than that they should risk their salaries and their popularity by doing what they know to be right. The Invasion Committee must provide them with an escape. It must deny the danger, pretend that the invader will never come with 70,000 men, and tell a complacent people to sleep comfortably in their beds. For that purpose it has indeed been admirably chosen. NAVALIS.

SIDE LIGHTS ON THE ITALO-TURKISH WAR

THE immediate factors which led to this event, the conduct of the campaign and the results achieved, combine to form a subject which is still, as it were, in its crude state, unfreed as yet by time's crucible from the alloy of passion. For this very reason, however, it possesses a peculiar interest, more thrilling because more personal, than that aroused by the historical study of original causes, which latter may be summarised under the three heads of geographical position, expanding population, and absorption of Northern Africa by other Powers. During this progress Italy had remained a spectator, paralysed as she was by the timorous policy of rulers who lay inactive under the incubus of a yearly increasing deficit and a sorry estimate of national cohesion and perseverance; thus the Roman Government had committed the irreparable error of refusing to co-operate with England in Egypt, and thus it had acquiesced in the French occupation of Tunis.

Some compensation had, however, been admitted by the more fortunate players at the game of grab, and Italy's right to the reversion of the Tripolitaine had been allowed by two co-heiresses of the sick man's heritage who had already made good their equally dubious claims by the primeval law of might. The question was merely when and how the change should be effected. A resort to arms was undesirable both from the international and internal points of view. It jeopardised the general equilibrium, it struck a discord in a country where colonial warfare was held to be synonymous with disaster. A scheme of industrial conquest had, therefore, been unfolding itself for some years under the auspices of the Banco di Roma, with the ultimate object of a monetary transaction with Turkey as against a protectorate to be established by Italy, whose

Budget had, in the meantime, been transformed by able Ministers, and especially by Luzzatti and Sonnino, into the most solid of any country in Europe. But these plans were upset by the leaping into power at Constantinople of that distracted aggregation of Turkish Semites whose loudly proclaimed youth was perhaps the only excuse for their lack of judgment; a deplorable event this, which substituted for the genuine Abdul-Hamid (a tyrant truly, but a monocrat and an astute diplomatist) a jangling clique of imitation Abdul Hamids who added arrogance, ambition, and political crassness to the qualities which had earned their late monarch the title bestowed on him by Mr. William Morris. With such a crowd it was impossible to deal, though every month rendered a conclusion more imperative; for Turkish officialdom, by a shrewish policy of nagging obstruction, was calling the attention of Italy to the shores of the Tripolitaine, there gradually exasperating a friendly people who, through the mouthpiece of the Nationalist Party, began to clamour for redress. In this contingency the Prime Minister, Signor Luzzatti, adopted a conciliatory tone which procured him the accusation of pusillanimity. As a matter of fact, he was strongly against war and was convinced that the nation was morally unprepared for it. A militant attitude would have produced the theoretical repentance of Turkey and the practical rearmament of the Tripoli forts, which results would have been ephemeral in the first case and pernicious in the second. So the statesman who had sat in the Chamber beside Sella and Minghetti received the taunt of cowardice in silence.

We are now come to 1911, in the spring of which year Signor Luzzatti, unwilling to associate himself with the radical tendencies of his colleagues in regard to certain home measures, retired from the Premiership in favour of Signor Giolitti, to whom he bequeathed the present Foreign Secretary and the Ministers of War and Marine. The new ruler entered with a programme smeared with honey for Socialist flies. Universal Suffrage and State Monopoly of Life Insurances were the chief attractions. But the former seemed doomed to remain in the chrysalis stage owing to the lengthy contest aroused over the latter which, attacked by the deputies for the industrial north and pulverised by Signor Luzzatti in the *Corriere della Sera*, was only saved by the inter-

vention of its champion, who adjourned the House for the summer holidays.

The Extreme Left, upon whom Signor Giolitti's tenure of office depended, now showed, in their disappointment, evident signs of mutiny, and it became clear that the time had come when the Prime Minister must either shuffle the cards or leave the gaming-table. He chose the former course, and was charged by his Socialist friends with Machiavellian duplicity in having sold his conscience to retain his power. He certainly was against a rupture with Turkey, and was the last State dignitary, except King Victor Emmanuel himself, to be persuaded of the necessity for so extreme a measure, but it seems to the unbiased mind that his reluctance was founded on his recollections of the Adua episode and his consequently pessimistic conception of the moral stamina of his countrymen. Consummate handler of the Parliamentary machine, he must have perceived the temporary personal gain that would accrue by adopting a policy which would assure him an almost unanimous vote; but the fate of Crispi taught him that to precede public opinion in undertaking an African war was to risk being shot in the back by his own followers. Prudence counselled him, in the names of self-interest and of patriotism too, to lag behind the movement and be dragged forward by its impulse; the enterprise, if enterprise there must be, should be a whole-hearted and a national one, launched at that psychological moment in which pent-up enthusiasm should burst its bounds and clamorously shift the responsibility from the rulers to the people.

The autumn was now approaching, and stories of insult and oppression on the part of the Tripoli officials began to grow more frequent in the leading Press, while accounts of the African littoral, with its industrial and colonial possibilities, appeared and reappeared with notable consistency. How far this upheaval was spontaneous and how far artificial it would be impossible to indicate with precision. From highly informed sources came the whisper that the Secretary and Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs were not averse to its influence on the people. If this were so their sympathies were those of consistent and logical men. The pacifying attitude assumed by the Marchese di San Giuliano in his official statement on the Tripoli question

had given rise to an outcry which had precipitated, and not retarded, the progress of events. Perhaps it was so intended. The late trouble in Morocco led him naturally to fear that a similar surprise might be in store for Italy; then it must be remembered that both the Marchese and his Under-Secretary the Principe di Scalea are of Sicilian birth, and are therefore firmly convinced of what is probably the truth, that the Tripolitaine will year by year prove a greater boon to Sicilian emigrants and, through them, to the mother country. Be this rumour as it may, the Nationalist Party at any rate were not idle, and the cry of the nation waxed louder day by day, penetrating, possessing, and absorbing the conversation of ever humbler units of the people, until the burning subject became tacitly understood as friend met friend in the streets, in the *piazze*, or on the doorsteps, "*Così si va o non si va?*" ("Well, are we going or ain't we going?") And the answer would come back with quiet and satisfied conviction: "*'Sta volta ti dico si va.*" ("We're going this time, I tell you.") All other words were superfluous. The destination could be only one.

A remarkable phenomenon was now observed in the silence of the European Press before the deep-toned drama that was unfolding itself in the hearts of the Italian people. The reason, perhaps, is to be found in the very solemnity of the manifestation. There was no bombast or clamour, and Europe expected auricular proof before believing that Italy was in earnest; so the scant news which appeared in English or German papers pursued its course of woeful descriptions and warnings as to the cholera, posthumous the former and superfluous the latter, since the disease had been stamped out by the middle of September. And the general opinion of European chanceries too that Italy was a dog whose bark was not followed by its bite was fully endorsed at Constantinople, owing partly to the assurances of the German Ambassador, and partly to the innate aversion of Turkey to believe anything which might render action inevitable. But all scepticism was abruptly dispelled on September 28, and the ultimatum was followed next day by the bombardment of the Tripoli forts.

A description of the military operations would be far beyond the limits of this article, while Lord Percy's outline sketch in the

National Review of last September is so remarkable for accuracy (at a moment, too, in which gossip accepted without investigation was the order of the day) as to render a *résumé* of the campaign superfluous. Neither is it proposed again to refute the accusations of atrocities brought against the Italian Army by correspondents, and pseudo-correspondents, who were in several cases hundreds of miles away from the scenes which they professed to witness. For the credit of certain newspapers, the wretched episode is one to be buried in quicklime. But the same insufficient knowledge of Italy of to-day which gave birth to this error has created also an atmosphere of misconception in regard to the decisions of the Italian Government in Rome and to the operations of the Italian Army in Libya. The attempt may, therefore, not be amiss to clear up certain points not generally known, to throw side lights (even though they be dim) upon dark places.

The final steps which preceded the bombardment, namely the mobilisation on September 23, the ultimatum on September 28, and the first shot on September 29, were characterised by a somewhat suspicious haste, and the explanation shortly leaked out from very high quarters that news had been received of the imminent visit to Tobruk Harbour of a foreign warship, a visit which would have produced another *Panther* incident. This whisper was followed by hints, from the semi-official Press, of sinister designs on the part of England and France, but the argument was so clumsy as to persuade all who were not persuaded before that, if Naboth's vineyard was indeed at that moment an object of desire in others, the Ahab in this case was of Potsdam origin. Now, however, that peace has brought with it the resumption of party Government, certain of Signor Giolitti's opponents show themselves incredulous as to the truth of the rumour, and call to mind the Delphic ambiguity which has always shrouded the Prime Minister's utterances on the subject. "The conquest of Libya"—he says, for instance, in the Chamber, as late as March 15—"was conceived and carried out with the precise object (*proprio con l'intendimento*) of avoiding contests and quarrels over the occupation of a territory which *Italy could never have consented to see occupied by other nations*." The orator does not specifically state that there was immediate danger. But on the other hand,

what object could be gained by calling a phantom warship on the scenes? The creation of friction with other countries? That danger was throughout the war studiously, too studiously, avoided by the Italian authorities! The stimulating of public opinion then? But the difficulty for several weeks had been rather to restrain it! What cause, therefore, was served by a false report, propagated besides (though this is not generally known) before the striking force was ready? The navy was well prepared, the Grand Manœuvres having but just terminated; the land forces, however, were by no means at the same stage when the Foreign Secretary accompanied the Prime Minister to the War Office to inform General Spingardi that immediate hostilities were inevitable. Thus, in spite of the brilliant organisation of the military authorities, General Caneva was unable to sail till October 9, risking by this delay the opening of the campaign with a disaster of the gravest character, a disaster which was only averted by the coolness and resources of that born leader of men, Admiral Cagni, and his devoted band. This episode, like Admiral Millo's reconnaissance in the Dardanelles, is too familiar to need description. It is enough to say that 1500 lads, many of them stokers and artisans who had never handled a rifle, held Tripoli between October 5 to 13 by sheer dint of marching in unending circles through the town and so persuading the enemy that a continuous stream of men was disembarking. This hazardous stratagem which happily, to use the Admiral's words, "ended merely in a heavy bill for shoeleather," had not, however, been contemplated by the Roman authorities, since their information had led them to believe that the town would be given up on the first appearance of the fleet. But still it seems unlikely that, under any circumstances, they would have struck before being thoroughly prepared, unless compelled to do so by the most vital reasons, and no other can be assigned except that already mooted, unless it were the news, which arrived about September 20, that the Turks were preparing to pour arms into Tripoli. This tardy precaution on their part was productive of an incident destined to have much influence in prolonging the resistance of the Arabs and known as that of the *Derna*.

The departure of this ship and her mission had been duly

reported, and a torpedo-boat flotilla was on the look-out. The commander, an excellent officer, had orders to keep out of sight of land and, though war was not yet declared, to stop the *Derna*, but to be careful above all things not to produce international complications. When therefore a two-funnel vessel, corresponding to the description, was sighted one night, he approached her and, having read on her stern the name of a ship from Hamburg, steamed round her several times and received satisfactory answers, in German, to his questions. So the *Derna* pursued her course, deep-laden with arms for the natives, discharged her cargo successfully, and was sunk in Tripoli harbour by her crew.

The flight of the Turkish fleet from Beirut happened about the same time and gave rise to so many heart-burnings in the navy, and to so much romance on the part of the public, that a dispassionate relation of facts recounted on the highest authority may not be superfluous. Two days before the declaration of war a telegram was received from the Consul that the Turkish fleet had left Beirut, steering S.W. Of the two hypotheses, viz. that they were setting their course for Cirenaica or that the move masked a flight into the Dardanelles, the former had in its favour the presence of certain English officers in the Sultan's service respected by the Italians as "good sportsmen," and believed to be, in Irish parlance, "spiling for a fight." The enemy also possessed two fairly good ships and some excellent Schichau "scouts" which might do immense damage to Italian transports and landing operations before being brought to book. As this danger could not be ignored, the greater part of the fleet at any rate had to be kept at convoy work between Sicily and the African littoral; so the problem was whether it was advisable or not advisable to detach certain of the fastest units for cutting off the Turkish retreat, if retreat it indeed were, at the entrance to the Straits. Against this solution it was urged with success that the enemy would surely give the Italians a chance of meeting them by trying a sortie later on; secondly, that it was imprudent to further subdivide forces, seeing that a part of the torpedo flotilla under the Duke of the Abruzzi was already away watching the Albanian coast; thirdly, that the Roman Government intended to give notice that operations

would be confined entirely to Africa; and finally, that it had no wish to begin the campaign by intercepting the Turkish fleet when war was not declared, and by sinking vessels which were harmless if kept in the sea of Marmora, and whose defeat was a foregone conclusion if they issued from their hiding-place. Such a victory besides could bring no laurels to the conquerors and would merely provoke a howl of execration from the whole of Europe.

This morbid consideration for Europe's feelings was in fact the chief drag on the enterprise from first to last. The organisation both of the land and sea forces was as perfect as is consistent with human imperfection, but both General Spingardi and Admiral Leonardi Cattolica were accompanied throughout by tutors who never left their sides. History has not another instance of a war in which the political was so absolutely predominent over the military element. The bogey of European diplomacy fluttered its grave-clothes before men whose old-world education had taught them to believe in the fetish-power of the ancient idol; it was left for a people less highly civilised to show them that the so-called "concert" was *vox et prœterea nihil.* Had this been realised there would have been no tying of the Duke of the Abruzzi's hands in the Adriatic, no taboo of the Dardanelles; the war might possibly have been finished in a few weeks and might not have provoked the consequences which still hold Europe in their thrall. But the profession of "prophet of the past" has always been an overcrowded one; *del senno di poi ne son piene le fosse* ("the ditches are full of that wisdom which comes after the event").

The other fundamental error has already been touched upon, and is one of those which have always occurred in enterprises of this description. The Italian Consul in Tripoli, a patriotic but young official, was convinced that the occupation of Libya represented little more than a military parade before rejoicing Arabs impatient to throw off the hated Turkish yoke. Small blame can be put on him since his opinion was confirmed by elder and more experienced men such as the heroic Captain Verri and the officials of the Banco di Roma, which latter institution was convinced of its omnipotence with the deeply indebted native population, forgetting that it is often the debtor, and not

the creditor who dictates the terms. Such was the blunder, and the greatest praise is due to the Italian Government for having taken warning by the misfortunes of the English in the Transvaal and of the French in Tunis, and for not having committed the initial error of waiting for a reverse to prepare for war; but the conviction that the Arabs were to be treated as friends and equals permeated their military policy, rendering abhorrent negotiations with an inferior race on the only practical basis of gold or the halter, and protracting the struggle in a country of fanatics and warriors where the "quality of mercy" is construed as sheer weakness.

The conduct of the war from the military point of view brought out the efficiency of both army and navy staffs, and revealed the good qualities of the men at the front. The despatch with which the expeditionary force was prepared has already been noticed; the method with which it was supplied was equally meritorious. It must be remembered that petroleum was not procurable from Russia, that the Italian oil-ships in America could only load for twelve hours consecutively in any one port, that the most serious coal strike on record took place in England, and that, though over 32,000 projectiles were used, none could be bought abroad. Yet the oil, coal, and ammunition stores were even fuller at the end of the war than they had been at its commencement. Add to this that the commissariat department worked perfectly throughout in a country where even the wood for cooking had to be brought from Italy, and sometimes could not be landed for days on account of the sea; lastly, the hospital and red-cross sections, with their motor service for collecting the wounded, brought medical science in the camp and battlefield to a pitch of excellence which it had never known before.

With regard to the Fabian strategy of General Caneva, disapproved of by so many Moltkes of the beer-garden, a timid defence may be advanced on the basis of the results achieved. If a general has merit in directing a campaign in which about one hundred engagements, between battles and skirmishes, have been fought without sustaining a reverse, if credit be due to one who attains a prefixed object at a minimum cost of life and money, then Caneva has well deserved the honours bestowed on him by

his country; if, on the other hand, a war is to be deemed a mere gladiatorial show in the world's amphitheatre, if *panem et circenses* (viz. "copy" and commotion) be the cry of the European Press and public, in that case the general must be condemned as but a sorry showman. His words, spoken through Colonel Giardino, portray his feelings; he was responsible solely "to God and to his own conscience." He did his work unobtrusively but surely; he sacrificed military ambition to his sense of duty; he fought not for himself but for his country. The plan on which he acted was preconcerted with the authorities in Rome, two main objects being kept in view, the first that the war should not lose its popularity with the people of Italy, the second, that it should not weigh too heavily on the people of the Tripolitaine. In proposing the latter aim, Italy was merely following the steps of England in the Transvaal and was actuated by the same motives. The future alone can prove or disprove the practical advantages of this line of conduct; but no one can question the wisdom of the Government in desiring that the enterprise should be popular at home, and for this purpose the end had to be gained at a minimum expense and with a minimum number of victims, even at the sacrifice of time. Under the circumstances, therefore, an advance into the Garian hills was never contemplated as part of General Caneva's campaign, for the step, entailing the maintenance of communications and commissariat over sixty-five miles of intractable and insidious country, might have been magnificent but was not considered war. The army despatched had been, fortunately, twenty times in excess of the estimate given to Signor Giolitti, but the unexpected resistance rendered it in reality insufficient for operations over an extent of more than a thousand miles. Another "class" or two might have been called out, but the new mobilisation would have been an additional source of expense and have created uneasiness and diffidence; so it was decided to work with the original expeditionary force, using Tripoli, Bengasi, Derna and Homs as cardinal points, to be eventually joined by an unbroken line whose strength, however, naturally diminished in the direct ratio of its rapidly increasing length. This manœuvre once effected, it was calculated that the submission of the Arabs, with the desert behind them and the cannon in front of them,

was merely a question of time. Events have proved that the surmise was correct, for the country is being pacified with far less opposition than was expected, and the hold that Italy has acquired over the most truculent tribes of Northern Africa in little more than a year's occupation of the Tripolitaine, is considered as eminently satisfactory by competent men on the spot. But the plan adopted to gain the end was a fierce trial not only to the general and his officers but also to the men.

The Italian soldier is known for his offensive rather than for his defensive tactics. He is magnificent in a bayonet charge, but is difficult to hold in reserve. The Libyan war, however, called forth in him all those qualities for which he was formerly least famous, and the discipline and cheeriness shown by him during months of trench-work is therefore the more to his credit. This praise becomes the greater when it is remembered that both officers and men were bitterly aware of the galling misinterpretation put by Europe, and especially by Germany and Austria, on the inaction to which they were so unwillingly condemned by the most explicit and peremptory orders. The tedium of the trenches was broken by periodical brushes with an enemy who is both nimble and cunning and an admirable fighter besides, one who adopted his Parthian tactics of flying before the charge of the Italian soldiers, only to spring, like the fruit of the dragon's teeth, from the ground when the halt was called, and hang close on the heels of the weary troops as they retired once more to their earthworks. It was in these inevitable returns after sorties that the Italians lost far more men than they did in the advances or even in the battles; it was these manœuvres, too, that gave rise to the whisper that the Italian soldier was lacking in dash and courage, a whisper as frivolous, as ill-founded, and as infantile as that which, in October, had charged him with atrocities. The large proportion of officers who fell favoured the propagation of the calumny, the two real reasons for the phenomenon being either unknown or ignored. They are the following: firstly, that their bright blue sashes made them obvious targets for an enemy who, on account of his magic ability to take advantage of the ground, was often only fifty yards distant; secondly, that they vied with each other in exposing themselves with a recklessness which was qualified by the Minister for War himself as "im-

prudent." Yet the spirit which animated them was made an argument, by their ever-ready critics of Berlin and Vienna, for befouling the character of the very soldiers for whom they themselves can find no words of praise too high.

It is in this appreciation of his men that the secret of the Italian officer lies. He is not only their commander but their friend and adviser as well. He does not make them in one mould; he forms each one according to the material. Altruistic himself, he encourages initiative in his subordinates; devoid of arrogance, he treats them with a familiarity which breeds not contempt in this case but heightened deference. The Italian soldier is minute in his observance of discipline. Linked to his officer by veneration and affection, he strives to do more than his bare duty: he gives his whole self. This quality alone renders him a unit of real value; he possesses also in the highest degree the supreme virtue of sobriety. Drunkenness is practically unknown. The soldier of Northern and Central Italy is eminently abstemious; the Southerner goes to the point of seldom drinking anything but water. The result is seen in their patience under difficulties, and in that almost inexhaustible fund of good-humour and high spirits which cannot fail to strike any one who is brought, even temporarily, into contact with them. The Italian soldier in short adds virtues of his own to those which he has in common with his co-professionals in other neighbouring countries.

But to return to the Tripolitaine. Italy is now installed there and has already done more for civilisation in a year than her predecessor effected during the entire period of his misrule. The schools, the hospitals, the general hygiene, the great harbour works, now well advanced in Tripoli and Bengasi, attest the energy of a people who are come to improve their property and are come to stay there. Such in fact is their fixed intention and, whether the complete pacification of the country takes months or years, it will be surely effected. Persuasion will be used when possible, and if that fails more drastic measures will be taken. Such a course has lately imposed itself and will be pursued without undue consideration for the interests of third parties. But England and France will be the sufferers, and especially the former country by the hostilities in Cirenaica. The sooner the turbulent inhabitants are convinced that it is to their advantage

to accept accomplished facts the better for Great Britain, for this expedition fans into flame the undying embers of fanaticism and Islamism and, with them, of Egyptian nationalism as well. These are now the public enemies both of England and of Italy, and against them the two countries should come to a friendly understanding. English interests would therefore be served by favouring the new order of things with her moral co-operation in Egypt more than it is by showing prematurely an engrossing anxiety in regard to the delimitation of her frontier with maps in their present state of Ptolemaic inaccuracy. No difficulty whatsoever is to be apprehended over this necessary operation, but, in the opinion of the Roman Government, it is a secondary question which should be postponed to that of the establishment of quiet in Cirenaica, and this will come the speedier and be the more lasting if it be sought for by both nations for their common good in a spirit of " mutual confidence and mutual aid."

GIAN DELLA QUERCIA
(E. CAPEL CURE).

THE NEW WAR CORRESPONDENT

Returned to Kirk Kilisse from the Bulgarian lines at Chatalja (I was one of three English correspondents who succeeded in getting to the front for the final battle of the first stage of the Balkan War) I amused myself in an odd hour with burrowing among a great pile of newspapers in the Censor's office, and reading here and there the war news from English, French, and Belgian papers.

Dazed, dismayed, I recognised that I had altogether mistaken the duties of a war correspondent. For some six weeks I had been following an army in breathless, anxious chase of facts: wheedling censors to get some few of those facts into a telegraph office; learning then, perhaps, that the custom at that particular telegraph office was to forward telegrams to Sofia, a ten days' journey, by bullock-waggon and railway, to give them time to mature. Now here, piping hot, were the stories of the war. There was the touching prose poem about King Ferdinand following his troops to the front in a military train, which was his temporary palace. One part of the carriage, serving as his bed-chamber, was taken up with a portrait of his mother, and to that picture he looked ever for encouragement, for advice, for praise. Had there been that day a "*Te Deum*" for a great victory? He looked at the picture and added, "*Te Matrem.*"

It was a beautiful story, and why should anyone let loose a brutal bulldog of a fact and point out that King Ferdinand during the campaign lived in temporary palaces at Stara Zagora and Kirk Kilisse and when he travelled on a visit to some point near the front it was usually by motor-car?

In a paper of another nationality there was a vivid story of the battle of Chatalja. This story started the battle seven days too soon; had the positions and the armies all wrong;

the result all wrong; and the picturesque details were in harmony. But for the purposes of the public it was a very good story of a battle. Those men who, after great hardships, were enabled to see the actual battle found that the poor messages which the Censor permitted them to send took ten days or more in transmission to London. Why have taken all the trouble and expense of going to the front? Buda-Pest, on the way there, is a lovely city; Bucharest also; and charming Vienna was not at all too far away if you had a good staff map and a lively military imagination.

In yet another paper there was a vivid picture—scenery, date, Greenwich time, and all to give an air of artistic verisimilitude—of the signing of the Peace armistice. The armistice had not been signed at the time, was not signed for some days after. But it would have been absurd to have waited, since "our special correspondent" had seen it all in advance, right down to the embrace of the Turkish delegate and the Bulgarian delegate, and knew that some of the conditions were that the Turkish commissariat was to feed the Bulgarian troops at Chatalja and the Bulgarian commissariat the Turkish troops in Adrianople. If his paper had waited for the truth that most charming story would never have seen the light.

So, in a little book I shall one day bring out in the "Attractive Occupations" series on "How to be a War Correspondent," I shall give this general advice:

1. Before operations begin, visit the army to which you are accredited, and take notes of the general appearance of officers and men. Also learn a few military phrases of their language. Ascertain all possible particulars of a personal character concerning the generals and chief officers.

2. Return then to a base outside the country. It must have good telegraph communication with your newspaper. For the rest you may decide its locality by the quality of the wine, or the beer, or the cooking.

3. Secure a set of good maps of the scene of operations. It will be handy also to have any books which have been published describing campaigns over the same *terrain*.

4. Keep in touch with the official bulletins issued by the military authorities from the scene of operations. But be on

guard not to become enslaved by them. If, for instance, you wait for official notices of battles, you will be much hampered in your picturesque work. Fight battles when they ought to be fought and how they ought to be fought. The story's the thing.

5. A little sprinkling of personal experience is wise: for example a bivouac on the battlefield, toasting your bacon at a fire made of a broken-down gun carriage with a bayonet taken from a dead soldier. Mention the nationality of the bacon. You cannot be too precise in details.

Ko-Ko's account of the execution of Nankipoo is, in short, the model for the future war correspondent. The other sort of war correspondent, who patiently studied and recorded operations, seems to be doomed. In the nature of things it must be so. The more competent and the more accurate he is, the greater the danger he is to the army which he accompanies. His despatches, published in his newspaper and telegraphed promptly to the other side, gives to them at a cheap cost that information of what is going on *behind* their enemy's screen of scouts which is so vital to tactical, and sometimes to strategical, dispositions. To try to obtain that information an army pours out much blood and treasure; to guard that information an army will consume a full third of its energies in an elaborate system of mystification. A modern army must either banish the war correspondent altogether or subject him to such restrictions of censorship as to veto honest, accurate, and prompt criticism or record of operations.

The Bulgarian Army, to which I was attached during the first phase of the recent war, had not the courage to refuse authorisation to the swarm of journalists which descended upon its headquarters. Editors had argued it out that the small Balkan States, anxious to have a "good press" in Europe, would give correspondents a good show. But the Bulgarian authorities, anxious as they were to conciliate foreign public opinion, dared not allow a free run to the newspaper representatives. Apart from the considerations I have mentioned which must govern any modern war, there were special reasons why the Bulgarians should be nervous of observation. They were waging war on "forlorn hope" lines with the slenderest

resources, with the knowledge that officers and men—especially transport officers—had to do almost the impossible to win through. Further, they had the knowledge that in some cases the correspondents were representing the newspapers (*and* the governments, for newspapers and cabinets often work hand-in-hand on the Continent) of nations which were at the very moment threatening mobilisation against the Balkan States. To have specially excepted all Roumanian, Austrian, and German Press representatives from permission to see operations would have been impossible. The method was adopted of authorising as many press correspondents as cared to apply, then carefully pocketing them where they could see nothing, and instituting such a rigorous censorship as to guard effectively against any important facts, gleaned indirectly, leaking out. A few managed to earn enough of the Bulgarian confidence to be allowed to go through to the front and see things. But, even then, the censorship and the monopoly of the telegraph line for military messages prevented them from despatching anything.

Some of the correspondents—one in particular—overcame a secretive military system and a harsh censorship by the use of a skilled imagination, and of a friendly telegraph line outside the area of censorship. At the staff headquarters at Stara Zagora during the early days of the campaign, when we were all straining at the leash to get to the front, waiting and fussing, he was working, reconstructing the operations with maps and a fine imagination, and never allowing his paper to want for news. I think that he was quite prepared to have taken pupils for his new school of war correspondents. Often he would come to me for a yarn—in halting French on both sides—and would explain the campaign as it was being carried on. One eloquent gesture he habitually had—a sweeping motion which brought his arms together as though they were gathering up a bundle of spears, then the hands would meet in an expressive squeeze. "It is that," he said, "it is Napoleonic."

Probably the Censor at this stage did not interfere much with his activities, content enough to allow fanciful descriptions of Napoleonic strategy to go to the outer world. But, in my experience, facts, if one ascertained something independently, were not treated kindly.

"Why not?" I asked the Censor vexedly about one message he had stopped. "It is true."

"Yes, that is the trouble," he said—the nearest approach to a joke I ever got out of a Bulgarian, for they are a sober, God-fearing, and humour-fearing race.

The idea of the Bulgarian censorship in regard to the privileges and duties of the war correspondent was further illustrated to me on another occasion when a harmless map of a past phase of the campaign was stopped.

"Then what am I to send?" I asked.

"There are the bulletins," he said.

"Yes, the bulletins which are just your bald official account of week-old happenings which are sent to every news agency in Europe before we see them!"

"But you are a war correspondent. You can add to them in your own language."

Remembering that conversation, I suspect that at first the Bulgarian censorship did not object to fairy tales passing over the wires, though the way was blocked for exact observation. An enterprising story-maker had not very serious difficulties at the outset. Afterwards there was a change, and even the writer of fairy stories had to work outside the range of the Censor.

We were all allowed down to Mustapha Pasha and considered that that was a big step to the front. "For two days or so," we were told, it would be our duty to wait patiently within the town (the battle-ground around Adrianople was about twelve miles distant). Some waited there two months and saw no real operations. The censorship at Mustapha Pasha was so strict that all private letters had to be submitted, and if they were in English the English Censor insisted that they should be read to him aloud: and he re-read them, again aloud, to see if he had fully grasped their significance. Then they could go if they contained no military information and did not mention guns, oxen, soldiers, roads, mud, dirt, or other tabooed subjects. An amusing "rag" was tried on the Censor there. A sorely tried correspondent wrote a letter of extreme warmth to an imaginary sweetheart. This began "Ducksie Darling," and continued in the same strain for two pages. He waited until there was a full house—the Censors had no private office, but

did their censoring in a large room which was open to all the correspondents—and then submitted his ardent outburst. Other pressmen did not see the joke at first, and began to sidle out of the room as, like a stream of warm treacle, the love-letter flowed on. But they came back.

"Ducksie Darling," began the writer, "that you know is not a military term. It is a phrase of endearment used in England.—A thousand, thousand kisses—that has nothing to do with the disposition of troops." So he went through to the honeyed end, the Censor blushing and furious, the audience hilarious.

The Mustapha Pasha censorship would not allow ox-waggons, reservists, or Servians to be mentioned, nor officers' names. "I cannot send you photographs of the guns passing through," reported one American photographer to his editor. "It is a military secret that the Bulgarians have any guns." The censorship objected, too, for a long time to any mention of the all-pervading mud which was the chief item of interest in the town's life. Yet you might have lost an army division in some of the puddles. (But stop, I am lapsing into the picturesque ways of the new school of correspondents. Actually you could not have lost more than a regiment in the largest mud puddle.)

Let the position be frankly faced that if one is with an army in modern warfare, common sense prohibits the authorities from allowing you to see anything, and suggests the further precautions of a strict censorship and a general hold-up of wires until their military value (and therefore their "news" value) has passed. If your paper wants picturesque stories hot off the grill it is much better not to be with the army (which means in effect in the rear of the army), but to write about its deeds from outside the radius of the censorship.

Perhaps, though, your paper has old-fashioned prejudices in favour of veracity and will be annoyed if your imagination leads you too palpably astray? In that case do not venture to be a war correspondent at all. If you do not invent, you will send nothing of value. If you invent you will be reprimanded.

Let me give a personal record of "getting to the front" and the net result of the trouble and the expense. I went down

to Mustapha Pasha with the great body of war correspondents and soon recognised that there was no hope of useful work there. The attacking army was at a standstill and a long, wearisome siege—its operations strictly guarded from inspection—was in prospect. I decided to get back to staff headquarters (then at Stara Zagora) and just managed to catch the staff before it moved on to Kirk Kilisse. By threatening to return to London at once I got a promise of leave to join the Third Army and to "see some fighting."

The promise anticipated the actual granting of leave by two days. It would be tedious to record all the little and big difficulties that were then encountered through the reluctance of the military authorities to allow one to get transport or help of any kind. But four days later I was marching out of Mustapha Pasha on the way to Kirk Kilisse by way of Adrianople, a bullock waggon carrying my baggage, an interpreter trundling my bicycle, I riding a small pony. The interpreter was gloomy and disinclined to face the hardships and dangers (mostly fancied) of the journey. Beside the driver (a Macedonian) marched a soldier with fixed bayonet. Persuasion was necessary to force the driver to undertake the journey and a friendly transport officer had, with more or less legality, put at my command this means of argument. A mile outside Mustapha Pasha the soldier turned back and I was left to coax my unwilling helpers on a four days' journey across a war-stricken countryside, swept of all supplies, infested with savage dogs (fortunately well-fed by the harvest of the battle-fields) liable to ravage by roving bands.

That night I gave the Macedonian driver some jam and some meat to eke out his bread and cheese.

"That is better than having a bayonet poked into your inside," I said, by pantomime. He understood, grinned, and gave no great trouble thereafter, though he was always in a state of pitiable funk when I left the waggon to take a trip within the lines of the besieging forces.

So to Kirk Kilisse. There I got to General Savoff himself and won not only leave, but a letter of aid to go down to the Third Army at the lines of Chatalja. But by then what must be the final battle of the war was imminent. Every hour of

delay was dangerous. To go by cart meant a journey of several days. A military train was available part of the way if I were content to drop interpreter, horse, and baggage, and travel with a soldier's load.

That decision was easy enough at the moment—though I sometimes regretted it afterwards when the only pair of riding breeches I had with me gave out at the knees and I had to walk the earth ragged—and by train I got to Tcherloo. There a friendly artillery officer helped me to get a cart (springless) and two fast horses. He insisted also on giving me a patrol, a single Bulgarian soldier, with 200 rounds of ammunition, as Bashi-Bazouks were ranging the country. I objected that I had a revolver, and there was the driver, a Greek. "He would run away," said the officer pleasantly, and the patrol was taken.

It was an unnecessary precaution, though the presence of the soldier was comforting as we entered Silviri at night, the outskirts of the town deserted, the chattering of the driver's teeth audible over the clamour of the cart, the gutted houses ideal refuges for prowling bands. From Silviri to Chatalja there was again no appearance of Bashi-Bazouks. But thought of another danger obtruded as we came near the lines and encountered men from the Bulgarian army suffering from the choleraic dysentery which had then begun its ravages. To one dying soldier by the roadside I gave brandy; and then had to leave him with his mates, who were trying to get him to a hospital. They were sorely puzzled by his cries, his pitiful grimaces. Wounds they knew and the pain of them they despised. They could not comprehend this disease which took away all the manhood of a stoic peasant and made him weak in spirit as an ailing child.

From Chatalja, the right flank of the Bulgarian position, I passed along the front to Ermenikioi ("the village of Armenians"), passing the night at Arjenli, near the centre and the headquarters of the ammunition park. That night at Arjenli seemed to make a rough and sometimes perilous journey, which had extended over seven days, worth while. The Commander, an artillery officer, welcomed me to a little mess which the Bulgarian officers and non-commissioned officers (six in all) had set up in a clean room of a village house. We had dinner, "Turkish fashion,"

squatting round a dish of stewed goat and rice, and then smoked excellent cigarettes through the evening hours as we looked out on the Chatalja lines.

Arjenli is perched on a high hill, to the west of Ermenikioi. It gave a view of all the Chatalja position—the range of hills stretching from the Black Sea to the Sea of Marmora, along which the Bulgarians were entrenched, and, beyond the invisible valley, the second range which held the Turkish defence. Over the Turkish lines, like a standard, shone in the clear sky a crescent moon, within its tip a bright star. It seemed an omen, an omen of good to the Turks. My Australian eye instinctively sought for the Southern Cross ranged against it in the sky in sign that the Christian standard held the Heavens too. I sought in vain in those northern latitudes, shivered a little and, as though arguing against a superstitious thought, said to myself: "But there is the Great Bear."

Now there had been "good copy" in the journey. At Arjenli I happened to be the witness of a vivid dramatic scene (more stirring than any battle incident) of which I told something in a recent *National Review* article. It was a splendid incident, showing the high courage and *moral* of these peasant soldiers at an anxious time. To have witnessed it, participated in it, was personal reward sufficient for a week of toil and anxiety. To my paper too, the reader might say, it was of some value, if properly told and given to the London reader the next morning, the day before the battle of Chatalja.

Yes. But it was the next afternoon before I could get to a telegraph office within the Bulgarian lines. Then the censor said any long message was hopeless. I was allowed to send a bare 100 words. They reached London eight days later, a week after the battle had been fought, when London was interested no longer in anything but the armistice negotiations. The reason was that the single telegraph line was monopolised for military business. My account of the battle of Chatalja reached London a full fortnight after the event, though I had the advantage of the highest influence to expedite the message.

Thus from a daily newspaper point of view all the expense, toil, danger were wasted. For every pound spent "the office" got a shilling's worth at the most. And that is not good business.

Summing up an argument which I have indicated rather than developed, an accurate and prompt press service as war correspondent with the Bulgarian Army was impossible, because

1. The Bulgarian authorities were keen that correspondents should see nothing.

2. A rigid first censorship checked a full record of what little was seen.

3. The first censorship being passed, despatches often had still to pass a second censorship at staff headquarters, a third censorship at Sofia.

4. Despatches passing through Roumania underwent another censorship there, and yet another in Austria, possibly yet others in other European countries.

5. In addition to these censorship delays the Bulgarian authorities made newspaper messages yield precedence to military messages and at the front this meant that press messages were sent on by mail (ox transport most of the way) to the staff headquarters or the capital.

6. In the meanwhile the imaginative accounts written nearer Fleet Street had been published, and the accurate news was "dead" from a point of public interest.

Most of these conditions will rule over all future wars. Therefore I conclude that the day of the war correspondent—in the sense of a truthful observer of a campaign—has gone. He can only survive if newspapers are willing to incur the very great expense of sending out war correspondents not for the news, day by day, but for what observation and criticism they could supply after the campaign was over. To a daily newspaper such matter is almost valueless, especially as during the progress of the campaign the correspondents of the "new" school would be at work with their many inventions, raising the hair of the public and the circulation of their journals with bright feats of imagination.

FRANK FOX.

THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

ITS COUNCILLORS AND ITS COMPROMISE

The Conservative Party, having, so far as external signs could be interpreted, secured a favourable verdict from the constituencies at the next election, has allowed itself to be caught in the meshes of a new trial, and stands once more in the dock to defend its position before the country. It is true that the unworthiness of its opponents seems at first sight to make a verdict in their favour impossible, but that is scarcely a good reason for reopening a *chose jugée* and recapitulating facts which have already been proved up to the hilt.

This, however, is now inevitable. The Government, in spite of the Prime Minister's assurance, while the Parliament Act was under discussion, that nothing of the kind was to be apprehended, are attempting to complete a revolutionary programme while the Constitution remains in abeyance. As this end is not compatible with the forms even of single-chamber rule, they have shamelessly bribed the several fragments of the Coalition which supports them to acquiesce in reducing the House of Commons to the level of degradation which had previously been imposed on the House of Lords, and by that means they have attained a position of despotism as absolute and as grinding as any known to history, by whatever name it may have been called.

That Britons never will be slaves has hitherto been something more than the chorus of a popular song. At every previous crisis in the nation's history it has been a proposition in defence of which men were prepared to bleed; and it is slavery—nothing less—which this Government are in a position to impose. Already, through a crowd of officials privileged to interfere with many details of private life, they have begun to impose it, but unless

the old spirit is quite dead, their operations will meet with a sharp check, and they would probably have met with it before now but for the following circumstance. Although the Press is predominantly Conservative, its attitude has done more than any other single influence to keep the Government in power. The Government has at command a cluster of journals ably written and edited, some of whose owners have a pecuniary interest bound up with the economic policy it professes, and throughout the seven years of its existence those journals have consistently acted up to the motto: "My party, right or wrong." No statement has been too wild, no argument too puerile, no misrepresentation too glaring to serve as fuel for party purposes. With the Conservative press, actual and putative, the case has been quite different. Notwithstanding the tortuous methods which paved the Radical road to power, notwithstanding the significant evidence which the new Government's programme betrayed of an intention to base their policy upon the principle of bribing their supporters and robbing their opponents, it never seemed to strike the Conservative Press that the principles which they profess to support were in mortal peril from foes who recognise no rule of warfare, no code of etiquette. Hence for those who in public life uphold those principles there was often nothing warmer than friendship, expressed sometimes with more than usual candour, while for those who attack those principles there was chivalrous indulgence and not unfrequent encouragement. When the Government brought in measures embracing a principle for which there is something to be said, they hastened to make the most of it, although, of course, their editors are quite aware that the virtue of a principle depends almost entirely upon the method of its application, and that a corrupt tree, whatever the appearance of the blossom, can bring forth nothing but evil fruit. Methods of expressing encouragement or disapproval have, of course, varied very much, but it is questionable whether up to this very hour the vast accumulation of revolutionary antics, scandalous intrigues, and transparent hypocrisies with which the Government is chargeable has inspired any Opposition journalist, the Editor of this Review excepted, with the spirit in which Voltaire exclaimed, "Il faut écraser l'infâme!"

Faint praise on the one hand, faint blame on the other, is

largely accountable for the apathy, especially among the middle class, with which the rank and file of the Conservative Party have been justly charged. Men whose lives are full of business or of pleasure or of both, when they perceive that those on whom they rely as guides to their opinion find so little to say in favour of one side, so little in blame of the other, naturally go about their occupations with a comfortable conviction that no exertion on their part is needed to bring about a change. It should be different with prominent politicians, who presumably claim to be guides unto themselves, but it is occasionally difficult to resist the impression that some of our prominent politicians of the Conservative Party are infected with a philosophic detachment nearly equal to that observable in the Conservative Press.

If, however, the foregoing remarks have a reasonable application to the Conservative Press generally, there is one section of it which, while habitually masquerading in Conservative colours, has done the party damage enough to justify its being regarded as a snake in the grass. If history takes stock of it, it will be as a notable wet blanket upon the Imperial aspirations of our race, as innumerable incidents could testify.

On November 15, 1912, the delegates from the Conservative Associations which constitute the National Union assembled in their thousands at the Albert Hall and adopted a definite constructive policy upon the subject of Tariff Reform. They had done the same thing in several successive years at various places, but this was an occasion marked by exceptional features. It was the first representative meeting held since the amalgamation of Conservatives and Liberal-Unionists took place. The principles and main details of the first constructive policy, including the rearrangement of food duties, were recapitulated by the leaders of the amalgamated party in both Houses of Parliament. The Referendum was specifically thrown overboard, and the spirit of the meeting was unanimous and unprecedentedly enthusiastic.

Within a few weeks of that date there were rumours of faint-heartedness in the air, to which certain Unionist newspapers gave early expression. Within two months faint-heartedness had gained the upper hand. The most important part of that which had been definite at the Albert Hall had become indefinite; it was no longer the policy of the leaders or of the delegates or of Mr. Joseph

Chamberlain, but the policy embraced in a memorial embodying a compromise over which these organs of light and leading rejoiced with a fervour suggestive of parentage. That Memorial has never been published—a great injustice to outsiders who take an interest in the fortunes of the party, because, although the outlines of the so-called compromise are known, it is not known with any exactitude either whom it binds or what it binds them to—that is to say, at what phase of the various transactions contemplated the signatories will be entitled to resume their individual discretion. Evidence on both these points must be sought elsewhere.

Not many days after the result of the reshuffle had been officially announced, a meeting of gentlemen who regard dogma as a safer guide than experience was held in the City of London. That meeting was attended and addressed by men of mark in the Conservative Party who cannot have considered themselves bound by any compromise, as the purpose of the meeting was to denounce the application of tariffs to any goods whatever. A month passes, and then a noble marquis, a Front Bench member of the Conservative Party, the head of a house distinguished in many ways, but notorious for the tenacity with which its members cling to their opinions, addresses a Primrose League meeting in Lancashire and, without any reservation concerning the future, describes the imposition of any food taxes not already existing as a revolutionary policy! What can this mean, except that Lord Salisbury, although possibly consenting to co-operate with his party in the matter of Tariffs upon foreign manufactured goods, would, as soon as any question of what he calls food taxes arose, holds himself at liberty to throw every obstacle in the way of a policy of which he and his brothers are well-known opponents. Following these incidents came the remarkable episode at Kendal, which afforded additional evidence that the compromise has no vitality outside the House of Commons and the uncertain orbit of the party machine—a fact emphasised at the time by many letters from Conservatives to the Press showing great diversity of opinion upon cardinal points which the said compromise purports to have set at rest, while even its warmest adherents seem to have assented to it under a delusion. The writer has before him the report of a speech delivered at Manchester on

March 29 by a politician who, as the son of a Cabinet Minister, the nephew of another, the grandson both on father and mother's side of brilliant and accomplished statesmen, has a pedigree which should entitle him to a place, perhaps the first place, in the political equivalent of the great contest to which his ancestor gave a name. Lord Derby is a warm supporter of the compromise, and he says that those who fail to adhere to it are "not good members of the Unionist Party, whichever wing they belong to." The latter expression is of evil omen and was never contemplated at the Albert Hall, but the speaker does nothing to facilitate the performance of the obligation he postulates, for in a later reference to food duties he betrays a complete misapprehension of the case. He says that when in the future (perhaps distant), the Unionists being in power, a concrete scheme has been arranged with the Colonies, "the country would be asked to vote on the scheme and to make some sacrifices in the present, in order to secure great advantages to those who come after." *Sacrifices?* What sacrifices, and by whom are they to be made? Not by the poor; they have on that point a guarantee from the leaders of the Conservative Party, and, as Mr. Bonar Law remarked at the Albert Hall, "if the people will not trust us that far, they will not trust us at all." It is quite right too that the guarantee should be given, because it puts a spoke in the wheel of panic-mongers, but the guarantors are well aware that the risk which it covers is negligible.

It is not through the trivial duties which any one contemplates imposing upon food products that the price of those products will be increased. It is, on the contrary, chiefly because those duties were not imposed long ago that the recent great rise in the price of those products is due. The population of the world is increasing much faster than the area of production to supply its necessities. Countries which have been large exporters of food products are ceasing to be so, and this is exceptionally serious for the United Kingdom because one of the effects of so-called Free Trade has been enormously to lessen its native production. If, instead of occupying ourselves for a decade or so with the application of bolts and bars, we had encouraged the Dominions to increase the area of their food production by giving them a preference in our markets

we should by this time have obtained a substantial addition to our supply of food—not food of which we might at any time be deprived by the action of hostile nations, but food upon which we should have the first call in a moment of desperate need. Food duties, in fact, which encourage the Empire to produce more mean for the United Kingdom, not dear food, but cheap food, and afford the only breakwater against that gradual advance in the price of food products from which we are suffering to-day, and to which as population increases all food-importing nations must submit who have no means of increasing their internal supply. Those who cannot look upon Imperial Preference in this light are clearly not at one with those who do, and unity on the basis of a compromise which ignores it is clearly unworkable and futile.

The latest proof that it must be so described is to be found in connection with the St. Albans division of Hertfordshire, where at the last election there was a majority of over two thousand in favour of the full Tariff Reform policy. The present member having announced that he will not seek re-election, an attempt was made by members of the Unionist Party to foist upon the constituency as prospective Unionist candidate a gentleman whose patriotism is unquestionable but whose political opinions, so far as they are known, centre round free wheat and forbidden alcohol. Owing to the latent good sense of the potential candidate himself, the attempt did not succeed, but incidentally it threw some light upon the recesses of rigid free-fooders who pay lip service to the Edinburgh policy. Their attitude in the matter is that, as the official definition of that policy makes no special mention of so-called food taxes, it ignores them, and they reserve to themselves full liberty to unmask their batteries whenever a Conservative Government makes any proposal for their imposition. A speech recently delivered by Lord Hugh Cecil at Salisbury—and alluded to in the *Morning Post* by so active a Tariff Reformer as Sir Joseph Lawrence as an eirenicon, perhaps because it refrains from emphasising that attitude—contains no syllable inconsistent with it.

Apart, however, from any logical aspect of the matter, it is contended that our present political conditions are such as may

justify men of widely divergent views upon a vital question in acting together for the common purpose of winning the next election, and thereby arresting the progress towards anarchy which the country under the auspices of the existing Government is making with rapid strides. With that bait dangled before their eyes as the reward of postponing Imperial Preference, many members of the House of Commons who fully grasp the necessity of the latter and the danger of delay in securing it, were induced to sign the fateful Memorial, but the writer hopes to show that the bait is a delusion, a mere shadow for which the substance was dropped.

No argument has been urged with more vigour and persistency than that the Radicals will no longer be able to describe their opponents as food-taxers, but the argument rests upon very flimsy grounds. In spite of its transparent insincerity, that expression has gradually become a household word in Radical circles. Some use it because it is contemptuous and misleading, others because, like that blessed word mesopotamia, it rolls off the tongue without effort of the brain. The writer has an acquaintance in his neighbourhood who occasionally writes to him for the mere pleasure, apparently, of trotting it out. Being a teetotaler, he is probably conscious of the comfort and nutriment derivable from the use of tea, coffee, sugar and tobacco, but unaware that these elementary requirements are heavily taxed and that incidentally every farthing of the duty falls upon the consumer. It is to this kind of ignorance that the Radical spouter trusts when he sows the expression broadcast. He does not care a straw what tax is imposed so long as it is not a tax on misrepresentation, and this he will not impose upon himself by ceasing to call the other party food-taxers so long as they proclaim that they have not changed their policy but only their method of procedure.

If then change of procedure does not free the Conservative Party from the imputation it dreads, how is it to secure the large turnover of votes which must be achieved if the party is to obtain an effective majority at the next election. It is possible, it is indeed likely, that the Government are preparing their own defeat. To men of education it probably seems out of the ques-

tion that a country which is not a South American Republic but claims, on the contrary, to take rank in the highest circle of civilisation, having had experience of these men, should regard them as fit custodians of its honour, its safety, or its traditions. But our electorate are not to any substantial extent men of education, and the question we are discussing is not, primarily, the degree of disgust which the Government's proceedings may be inspiring in the constituencies, though any evidence forthcoming on that point is a valuable adjunct to the controversy, but whether the recent *volte-face* of the Opposition is likely to stimulate or to reduce that sensation. What we primarily want to get at is the source of votes which will be cast on the Conservative side at the next election and which would have been withheld or cast on the other side if the Opposition had persevered upon the course marked out at the Albert Hall by the men at the wheel. These votes clearly will not come from convinced free importers, because to them tariffs are as anathema, and tariffs remain in the forefront of Conservative policy. Men of that persuasion did not in any perceptible number rally to the Conservative cause even when Mr. Balfour in November 1910, apparently in the hope of winning a pending general election, threw the whole policy of Tariff Reform into the melting-pot of the Referendum, and they certainly will not now that, for one part of the policy at all events, the Referendum has been abjured. The only possible accession of recruits, then, must come from among those who are supporters of a tariff as applied to manufactures but have a mysterious objection to considering the subject in connection with the crucial question of the country's food-supply. There have always been such men, but so far as is publicly known they are few in number, and constituencies have with singular unanimity refused to elect them whenever an adherent of the full policy of Tariff Reform has been available as a candidate. It is nevertheless upon this source that the advocates of the altered course are content to rely, and such evidence as there is up to now indicates that it will prove a broken reed. Since the change of procedure was adopted there have been three contested elections in the north of England which has been marked on all charts as the site of danger to so-called food-taxers, and the three districts of Chorley, Houghton-le-Spring

and Kendal, taken together, no doubt fairly indicate the tone of the electorate in that region. If the expected multitude who are so-called free-fooders first but Conservatives afterwards had come to the scratch, there should in these elections have been a large turnover of votes from the Coalition to the Conservative side, but, although the issues were somewhat confused by a three-cornered contest at Houghton-le-Spring and the election of a nondescript at Kendal, by no possible manipulation of figures can it be shown that on the balance the Conservatives gained at all, and according to the writer's calculation there was a considerable balance against them. But those elections teach another lesson which ought not to be left unnoticed. Those three industrial constituencies taken together have an electorate in round numbers of forty thousand, and of these, also in round numbers and counting the supporters of the Free-trading Colonel Weston, fifteen thousand voted for the Conservative candidates. It follows that five out of every eight of their electors either approve the action of the Government in regard to them or are indifferent upon such questions as the structure of the Constitution, the wrongs of Irish loyalists, and the spoliation of the Church, and are quite content to be governed by an irresponsible caucus so long as it offers them attractive bribes. From this it is clear, so far as the evidence goes, that the Conservative Party has no chance at all of winning a General Election against the Coalition unless it can satisfy the industrial classes that the proffered bribes are illusory and that they will gain more both in cash and in comfort by an effective measure of Tariff Reform and Imperial Preference than by any amelioration of their condition, which Radicals and Socialists in combination are able to effect.

It was one of the contentions of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, it is the contention of those who are working for the success of his policy now, and that contention has the concurrence of every prominent statesman in the Dominions, that a rearrangement of our food duties which would enable us to give the Dominions a preference in our market for that which they mainly produce, would enable them to reciprocate so as widely to extend that access to their markets which the preference already given has

by universal consent so beneficially affected. It is further contended that this addition to our commerce, coupled with that of reasonable protection to native industry in its own market, would so stimulate our production as in due course to occupy every vacant hand in the country and to circulate abundant wages throughout the arteries of our industrial life. This proposition, widely diffused through the capable medium of the Tariff Reform League, had convinced the reason of multitudes, who, recognising that tariff reform in its widest development and social reform are coupled and inseparable, were among the most zealous supporters of Conservative candidates at the last two elections, because Conservative candidates alone had mastered this truth.

Upon what ground can it be argued that this support, so much in evidence at by-elections before the change of procedure was announced, will not be alienated, will even be increased, by cutting the proposition into two parts and throwing into the background its most important moiety? To the writer it seems evident that the Conservative canvasser will be met with the following reply. For a comprehensive and coherent policy we had sympathy, it inspired us with hope, but for this mangled and disjointed policy we have no use. We prefer to take our chance with the rest in a scramble for the crumbs which fall from the Radical table.

Since the above was written there have been two further contested elections—one at Shrewsbury, the other at Whitechapel—resulting in some turnover of votes to the Conservative side; but at Shrewsbury, where the Conservative majority was increased by 117, the Opposition was of a nondescript character, whereas Whitechapel, which reduced the Conservative minority by 374, cannot, perhaps, be regarded as a normal constituency and here again we are faced with the fact that, although the diminished minority gave much joy to the party managers, out of every eight electors on the roll no more than three could be induced to vote for the Conservative candidate.

Taking the five elections which have succeeded "the change of procedure" together, all that the Conservative Party has got out of them is a Free Trader in their ranks instead of a Tariff Reformer.

Before these pages see the light there will be more elections, and it is to be hoped that in the meantime the Marconi revelations and the Government's cynical confession of indifference to social reform and electoral anomalies, unless they can be made subservient to party advantage, will have sunk deep into the national mind. But whatever may be the upshot of those elections, though it may in some sense qualify, it cannot alter the existing fact that, judging the future by the past, the Conservative Party must either hasten to reoccupy the strong position voluntarily vacated or seriously imperil the chance which its patriotism must desire, of restoring to the people those liberties upon which his Majesty's present Ministers have laid their impious hands.

EBURY.

GREATER BRITAIN AND INDIA

CANADIAN AFFAIRS

The Canadian Naval Aid Bill is still the dominant issue in Canadian politics. The closure proved effectual in bringing the prolonged discussion in the House of Commons to an end, and public opinion, leaving out of consideration the comments of the partisan Press, supports the Government method of dealing with the obstructive tactics of the Liberal minority. The Opposition journals lament the disappearance of "the only free Parliament in the Empire." But the country clearly sees that when liberty of discussion degenerates into libertinism steps must be taken to put an end to a flow of verbiage full of fury and signifying nothing—except a desire for an immediate General Election on the part of a remnant of professional politicians who have not yet realised that the electorate dismissed them two years ago not only because of the national distaste for American Reciprocity, but also because of the universal belief that their leaders had connived at systematic corruption and were no longer in touch with the larger problems of Canadian development. I never disguised my conviction, which was based on a knowledge of the feeling among business men on both sides of the political line of cleavage, that the Laurier Administration won its last victory at the polls in 1908 and was doomed to dismissal even if American Reciprocity—a policy which was not approved of by the "elder statesmen" of the Liberal Party —had not been adopted as a forlorn hope. In any case the adoption of some form of the closure would sooner or later have been inevitable. It is true, of course, that procedure in the Canadian House of Commons necessarily differs from that of the St. Stephen's assembly which was, but no longer is, a model

for all the autonomous communities of the Empire. In the Canadian case a vast amount of valuable time is saved owing to the fact that local affairs are dealt with by the Provincial legislatures. Another point to be considered is the position of the Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons, who is elected on a "straight" party vote when a new Government comes into power though he can seldom or never be accused of partiality. The adoption of the closure should involve the appointment of a non-partisan Speaker if the spirit, as well as the letter, of British institutions is to be maintained. Otherwise the Speaker is likely to degenerate into a Party official, as has actually happened in the United States, though no such change seems to have been contemplated by those who drew up the American Constitution, that written document through which so large an assortment of vehicles, from a coach-and-four to a six-cylinder motor-car, have been driven in the last century or so. Nevertheless the professionalism of the typical Canadian politician who obeys a "machine" without a soul to be saved or a body to be kicked would have rendered the closure necessary sooner rather than later. It was not so in the days when the average M.P. had another business to look after and was interested in shortening the session as far as was compatible with the businesslike conduct of public affairs. The *London Free Press*, which is capable of taking non-partisan views as befits one of the leading journals of a city of such charming individuality as the Ontarian *rus in urbe*, has been deploring the disappearance of Canada's captains of industry from the Canadian Parliament:

> The man who enters politics to-day in Canada must practically bid adieu to private business. He becomes instead a Parliamentarian. He makes politics his profession. Canada would be better without this growing class of professional politicians. She is sacrificing her best interests when her practical business men are barred from public service through the unnecessary length to which public business is drawn out.

It is true that a leisured class is springing up in Canada and that there are many young Canadians who are well-to-do and well-educated who could serve their country effectively if they were to choose politics as a career. Unfortunately these young men, like their American friends, prefer the social round as a sphere of influence; the dust and uproar of party warfare does not attract them and their outspoken contempt for the

professional politician (who is not in society, as an almost invariable rule) is another reason why the still great cry of true patriotism is unheard. For these young men, whose families have not a tradition of public service, a Canadian Navy would provide an outlet for the energy and enterprise which is at present wasted in the carefully chronicled doings of the "best set" in this or that city of less than cosmical consequence.

The vote on the third reading of the Naval Aid Bill was: Yeas, 99; Nays, 66. Five of the Quebec members of Mr. Borden's majority voted with the Opposition and one Liberal, Colonel H. Maclean, who sits for a New Brunswick constituency, voted with the Government. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's "last protest" was as follows:

> We oppose this policy because it does not recognise the duty which we owe ourselves as a nation. *We oppose this policy because it is not based on principle. It is* simply a makeshift and an expedient. We oppose this policy because, as stated by one of their leaders, it does not strike any root, it does not prepare the soil. It leaves no residue. We oppose it because this $35,000,000 should be applied to the organisation of the Canadian naval service in close co-operation with and in connection with the Imperial Navy. A Canadian service built, manned, and equipped in Canada—this is the goal to which we are looking, and it is because the present policy ignores all these duties that we say, "Revert to the old policy, which we all accepted in 1909, which should be accepted in 1913, and which we maintain in Opposition as we did in office."

The Opposition leader then moved that the measure should be suspended for six months. The Prime Minister's reply regretted that his opponents had not recognised the necessity of giving an object lesson *urbi et orbi* in the solidarity of Imperial sentiment and at the same time creating the basis of a Canadian Navy:

> These proposals of ours will afford immediate aid to the Naval forces of the Empire and from a material standpoint. But there is another standpoint—the moral support and strength which they will bring to the Empire. It is to be regretted that a few honourable gentlemen on the other side of the House have seen fit to speak with some exultation of their efforts in destroying that moral support and influence that otherwise would be drawn from this measure. This does not seem to me to be the spirit which should animate men who are earnestly and patriotically desirous of doing something which we regard as necessary and urgent in the interests of the whole Empire, because this proposal is not for Great Britain alone and not for Canada alone. Our proposal is to build three battleships of the most modern and powerful type and place them at the disposal of his Majesty the King for the common defence of the whole Empire. That is our policy. If hereafter the people of Canada should decide upon a policy of establishing a fleet unit in the Atlantic and another in the Pacific, the ships we propose to construct could be utilised for that purpose. They might in

all probability be so utilised even before they were put in commission. It is most unfortunate that this view has not impressed itself upon the entlemen on the other side of the House. So far as we are concerned, we believe that when half the forces of the Empire which uphold the flag in all oceans and upon all seas have been withdrawn to protect the heart of the Empire, when even the Mediterranean itself has been left very largely unguarded, the time has come when in a spirit of self-respect Canada ought not to quibble about these matters, but ought to come forward and do something immediate and effective, and that is what we propose by the measure which we have placed before the House.

It is difficult to say whether or not the Senate will reject the Bill. There can be no doubt whatever that the country is in favour of it, and Canada's "Secondary Chamber" the abolition of which has always been a plank in the Liberal platform, will greatly strengthen its position by considering the claims of a self-respecting nationality rather than those of a party allegiance, which, seeing that they are quite independent of the "machine" and its operations, do not count so much with the Liberal senators as might be imagined. Several of the Liberal senators are strong Imperialists, and may follow Colonel Hugh Maclean's example in the other House. Nor is it possible to say what action the Government would take if the Bill were rejected.

This at least is certain—whatever happens, the Liberal Party will be much weaker than it was before it fell into the slough of anti-Imperialism for the second time. A General Election at this juncture would reveal the fact that it is hopelessly discredited for the time being; if Mr. Borden were to choose that remedy less than thirty Liberals would return to their seats in the House. The chief plank in their present policy, to take only one point in their progressive collapse has crumbled into touchwood. There is every reason to believe that the imminent changes in the United States Tariff will give Canada nearly all that she would have gained under the American Reciprocity convention without requiring her to concede anything in return. Thus one of the chief arguments of the Conservative Party has been forthwith enforced by the logic of circumstances and the bottom of the Reciprocity policy (that bowl in which Sir Wilfrid Laurier and other Gothamites put out to sea three years ago) has been clean knocked out. As might have been expected, the manufacturer of that particular kind of fudge known as "party capital" has been compelled to make a right-about turn and to condemn freedom of access to the

American market, which they praised in 1911 as the greatest of boons, as the deadliest of dangers in 1913. In 1911 the Canadian was a producer of food-stuffs and the advocate of Reciprocity at any cost pointed out that the possibility of selling a portion of his crop in the United States would add greatly to his income. In 1913 he is, alas! only a consumer and the only effect of the Underwood Bill now in its committee stage at Washington will be an increase in the cost of living whenever there is a shortage of home-grown food-stuffs in the United States. If it were possible to convince the apologist for Free Trade that the producer and the consumer are much more often than not one and the same person, it might be possible to persuade him to take an intelligent view of Tariff issues. In Western Canada, however, the benefits that will accrue (especially to the grower of barley) from the passing of the Underwood Bill are thoroughly appreciated and nothing that the *Toronto Globe* and other Liberal journals can say will prevent the farmer from losing interest in Reciprocity. Alberta is already seceding, and it will not be long before polyglot Saskatchewan sees the futility of the 1911 forlorn hope of a gang of discredited politicians who must now make way for younger men with a right conception of what "Canadianism" is and what it must be.

After all, the prolonged discussion of the Naval Aid Bill has served several useful purposes. Canadians now take a keener and more intelligent interest in the problems of sea-power and even Opposition orators have been compelled to admit that the safety of the Empire is not to be secured by localised squadrons but only by a superior force within striking distance of the arch-enemy. The German peril has been duly authenticated, and all the talk of the "anti-militarists" (who are making much use of the grape-juice sentimentality of Mr. W. J. Bryan, who thinks the massing-up of European armaments ought to be stopped, but cannot say how it is to be done) will not convince the intelligent Canadian that Germany is not a predatory Power. Meanwhile Mother Country journals and speakers need not be too effusive in their expressions of gratitude to Canada for her offer of a contribution to the Imperial stock of sea-power. To the average Canadian it merely represents a repayment in part of a debt of long standing.

E. B. O.

INDIA

THE PUBLIC SERVICES COMMISSION

The Indian Public Services Commission has now completed its first series of peregrinations in India, and some attempt can be made to consider the character and prospects of its work. From the time of its appointment, the Commission was regarded with a certain apprehension by the Indian services. They did not fear an impartial enquiry into their position. In many respects they had grievances, particularly with regard to pay, leave allowances, and promotion, which they were anxious to bring to the notice of the home authorities. Their alarm was largely produced by the curious personnel of the Commission. The members are " a mixed lot," and some of them are not very well qualified to sit in judgment upon the important issues contained in the terms of reference. The services wondered why Lord Islington was brought from New Zealand to preside over the Commission, when a peer of the type of Lord Balfour of Burleigh would have commanded far greater confidence; they recognised that Sir Murray Hammick and Mr. F. G. Sly were capable administrators, but would have preferred as the service representatives men of wider experience who would have carried greater weight; and they marvelled at and in some degree resented the inclusion of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. Memories of the rambling investigations of the Decentralisation Commission are still vivid, and the possibility that the new Commission would be equally diffuse in its enquiries caused much anxiety. Thus from the moment of its arrival in India the Public Services Commission had to face an atmosphere tinged with mistrust. The fact that this mistrust was not shared by Indian politicians only made it more disconcerting. Most prominent Indians appeared to have made up their minds from the outset that the Commission was intended to undermine the present character and constitution of the Indian Civil Service. They therefore hailed its advent with the highest expectations.

One may now hope and believe that these expectations are not destined to be realised. The Commission will certainly not bless the existing order of things without considerable reservations, but on the other hand, when it comes to tackle its report

it will doubtless realise that revolutionary changes would have deplorable results upon India. Nevertheless, it began its work rather badly. Its terms of reference were "to examine and report upon the following matters in connection with the Indian Civil Service and other civil services, Imperial and Provincial:

"1. The methods of recruitment and the services of training and probation.

"2. The conditions of service, salary, leave, and pension.

"3. Such limitations as still exist in the employment of non-Europeans and the working of the existing system of division of services into Imperial and Provincial, and generally to consider the requirements of the public service and to recommend such changes as may seem expedient."

These terms of reference sounded cautious and reasonable, but at the very first sittings in Madras it was found with some surprise that the Commission was devoting a large amount of attention to the old threadbare question of simultaneous examinations for the Indian Civil Service in India and in England. This line of enquiry soon led to the cross-examination of witnesses upon the extremely invidious issue of the relative merits of Indians and Englishmen in the public services. English civil servants were asked to state whether they thought Indians were as good administrators as themselves. Indians were invited to air their views about English civilians. The statements made were telegraphed to newspapers all over India, and in a month a seemingly innocent Commission had succeeded in developing a deplorable and quite unnecessary outburst of racial feeling. The English civilians were exasperated, and "the hyper-sensitive Indian educated classes were touched upon the raw." The *Pioneer* remarked early in February that the Commission had produced "a fresh access of unrest in the Indian middle classes, a sense of humiliation throughout the public service, and an exasperation of racial feelings by drawing out and forcing into publicity all the unpleasant things that each side has to say about the other." The Allahabad journal added that if the Commission continued upon the same course "it may confidently count on being able to lay claim before its work is done to having created an amount of bitterness and ill-feeling that it will take years to eradicate." Fortunately for its own reputation,

the Commission eventually saw fit to modify this side of its activities, though not before it had managed to arouse an entirely fresh display of racial animosity by discussing in Rangoon whether natives of India proper were acceptable to the Burmese as public servants. It seems obvious that at the outset some members of the Commission got a little out of hand, and were not sufficiently kept in check by the chairman, whose lack of familiarity with things Indian presumably prevented him from realising the intensity of the feelings thus ruthlessly harrowed. By this time the Commission should have learned its lesson, and meanwhile it may be said that the character of its proceedings need not be entirely judged by the newspaper reports. The Indian newspapers relied upon telegraphic summaries, in which the more piquant fragments of the evidence were given prominence. The newspapers thus deepened an impression which had ample foundation, but which required qualification. Printed reports of the evidence are being placed before Parliament, and it will probably be found that much of the proceedings related to far more humdrum matters than simultaneous examinations and the executive capacity of Indians in the public service.

When every allowance is made, however, it must still be deemed unfortunate that these issues were openly discussed, and that officials in high places were remorselessly compelled to state their inmost convictions for the delectation of the public. After every question has been asked and answered, the Commission will not have derived much additional assistance in coming to a definite conclusion about the relative capacity of Indians and Englishmen. All that it has learned on these subjects could have been readily ascertained by less imprudent methods. Nor should it have been permitted to waste its time by renewed enquiries into the question of simultaneous examinations. No matter affecting the administration of India has been more exhaustively discussed in the past. Very few witnesses made statements or volunteered opinions upon the subject which threw any fresh light upon it. I do not say that the question of simultaneous examinations should not have been reopened. Plainly the time has come when it must be reconsidered, as part of the larger issues placed before the Commission. But it might have been weighed anew upon the accumulated records already in

existence, without questioning witnesses at inordinate length. As, however, a recommendation for or against simultaneous examinations will evidently form a prominent feature of the Commission's report, it is important to understand what these earlier records amount to.

Save for the limited advances made in the higher educational facilities of India during the last twenty-five years, the question of simultaneous examinations remains very much where it was at the time of the last Indian Public Services Commission. No new factors of importance have arisen since then, no fundamental changes have given it a new complexion. Such developments as have been witnessed are all in favour of the continuance of the present system of examinations in England alone. The old prejudice among Indians against crossing the sea has diminished, the facilities for travelling to England are far greater, the cost of the enterprise is less, and the number of Indians who come to England for study has vastly increased. In 1886–87 an Indian Public Services Commission was appointed, under the presidency of Sir Charles Aitchison, then Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab. It gave special and exhaustive attention to the question of simultaneous examinations, and the conclusions it recorded still hold good, in the opinion of the writer. These conclusions were repeatedly endorsed by many of the witnesses examined before the present Commission.

The Aitchison Commission asserted that, for the Indian Civil Service, "the only just criterion is that of fitness ascertained, where it is possible, by adequate tests, and where it is impossible, by impartial selection." It pointed out that as the Covenanted Civil Service might be said to represent the only permanent English official element in India, the importance of recruiting that service with reference to the maintenance of English principles and methods of government could not, in the opinion of the Commission, be overrated. Any uncertain note of policy in this respect might produce undesirable results. As to simultaneous examinations, the arguments advanced before the Commission in support of a competitive examination in India were the religious and caste objections which debar certain classes from crossing the sea; the reluctance of Indian parents to send their children to England at a comparatively early age; and the heavy expense involved.

The arguments against simultaneous examinations were:

1. In the present circumstances of social life in India, open competition in that country would not justify, to the same extent as similar competition in England, the presumption that the successful candidates would possess in a sufficient degree the qualities essential for high administrative office.

2. That Indian schools and colleges do not supply an education of a sufficiently high and liberal kind.

3. That an open competition in India would operate with inequality, excluding altogether some important classes of the community, while giving undue advantage to others.

4. In view, on the one hand, of the large number of candidates who would offer themselves for examination, and, on the other hand, of the small number who could, under any circumstances, be successful, the scheme could scarcely fail to create a large disappointed, and therefore probably discontented, class which would cause considerable embarrassment to the Government.

5. Pressure would sooner or later be brought to bear on the Government with a view to make the examination of a less English and a more Oriental character and to adjust it on terms more favourable to native candidates.

6. An injurious effect would be exercised upon the development of education in India, because private establishments would be created for preparing intended candidates, and the regular educational institutions would scarcely be able to resist the temptation of so shaping the course of their study as to secure success at the Indian examination rather than to impart a general liberal education to the mass of their scholars. Some witnesses expressed the opinion that the effect of unqualified competition in India upon general education "would be so disastrous as to constitute a national evil of great ultimate importance."

7. There would be a difficulty in maintaining the secrecy of the examination papers.

8. As regards the *viva voce* examination, it would be impossible to secure either uniformity of test or the high standard exacted in England if the work were undertaken by the professional staff available in India.

It should be understood that the foregoing points summarise,

not the conclusions of the Aitchison Commission, but the objections against simultaneous examinations placed before it. The Commission went on to record its conclusion that "it is inexpedient to hold an examination in India for the Covenanted Civil Service simultaneously with the examination in England." From the time the competitive system was introduced, it had been understood that the examination was to bear a distinctly English character, and to constitute a test of English qualifications. The most natural arrangement, therefore, was that the examination should be held in England, as being the centre of the educational system on which it was based. The Commission agreed that the effect of a competitive examination in India would be injurious to Indian education, and pointed out that even in England such examinations had evil results, although "the institutions for higher education are numerous enough to admit of the application of counterbalancing checks." In India, on the other hand, one of the chief difficulties was that of making the student appreciate the value of education for itself, and it was complained that the system of "cramming" already prevailed to a pernicious extent.

There are many other points noted in the report, but I have selected those which appear to be of chief importance. I may add, as an expression of my personal view, that the primary, though not the greatest, objection to simultaneous examinations is contained in point 7. I believe it would be absolutely impossible to ensure continuous secrecy in India regarding examination papers. In what is now a considerable experience, the only secret I have ever known to be kept in India was the decision to change the capital to Delhi. If the extraordinary measures adopted to keep that decision secret are ever made known, the difficulty of maintaining secrecy in India will be more readily understood. The contemporaneous decision to reconstitute afresh the province of Bengal was widely reported in the Imperial Durbar camp two or three days before the Durbar. The only reason why it was not prematurely published was that in the Press camp the story was not credited. India is full of stories of the premature and illicit disclosure of examination papers. The expedients devised to gain a knowledge of their contents almost pass belief. At Bombay on March 6 last Mr. G. S. Curtis, a well-known civil

servant, advanced a novel objection to simultaneous examinations while being examined before the present Commission. He said the difference in time between London and India would make such examinations difficult to arrange. The hours were 10 to 1 and 2 to 5. "If these hours were observed in Madras, a candidate could sit there and wire the morning papers to a friend in London, who would then have two hours at least to prepare. . . . In order to prevent the wiring of papers being possible, only one paper a day could be taken, beginning at 10 A.M. in London and 2 P.M. in India. This would spin out the examination to a month, making the strain intolerable." Mr. Curtis has in his time been a Postmaster-General, but I should have thought that the Telegraph Department could be invested with sufficient powers to prevent such an enterprise. I only mention his objection to illustrate the widespread conviction that in some way or other the secrecy of examinations would be violated.

The reason why Indian politicians have persistently clung to the hope that simultaneous examinations would be introduced is that the House of Commons in 1893 passed a resolution in favour of such a measure. In England no one, not even the Suffragettes, takes such casual and irresponsible resolutions very seriously. India, however, has never forgotten that the House resolved that in future all competitive examinations for "the Civil Services of India" should be held simultaneously in England and India, "such examinations . . . being identical in their nature, and all who compete being finally classified in one list according to merit." Lord Kimberley, who was then Secretary of State for India, set his heel upon the resolution when, in forwarding it to the Government of India, he remarked "that it is indispensable that an adequate number of the members of the Civil Service shall always be Europeans, and that no scheme would be admissible which does not fulfil that essential condition." Lord Wolverhampton, who meanwhile became Secretary of State, wrote a final minute upon receiving the reply of the Government of India, in which he said that her Majesty's Government had "reconsidered the whole subject with a full desire to give full weight to the arguments in favour of a system of simultaneous examinations, but they have arrived at the conclusion that there are insuperable objections to the establishment of that

system." Both these Ministers were stalwart Liberals of a type which is now unhappily disappearing.

To complete the record on this question, a few points from the evidence given before the present Commission may be added. Mr. Cardew, the Acting Chief Secretary to the Madras Government, gave five reasons against simultaneous examinations. They were: (1) Such a system would produce an immense increase in the number of Indian candidates. (2) This would mean a progressive increase in the number of successful Indian candidates. (3) In a few years the contingency might arise of 100 per cent. of the successful candidates being Indians, and no system should be adopted which might involve the elimination of the European element. (4) Any attempt to prescribe a minimum number of European admissions to the service would fail. (5) The *system of open competition was unworkable in* Southern India, owing to "the astonishing intellectual superiority of a small rigidly exclusive caste, the Brahman." Mr. Justice Sundara Aiyar, of Madras, favoured "independent" rather than simultaneous examinations. Mr. S. P. Sinha, the talented Hindu who was the first Indian member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, did not think simultaneous examinations practicable, but thought a fixed proportion of vacancies should be filled by natives of India "recruited primarily as the result of examinations held in London, and if necessary supplemented by the result of some examination held in India, and if not possible then a separate examination of a similar nature in India." He further thought that liberal allowances should be made to enable Indian students to compete in England, if supplementary examinations in India were disapproved. He suggested that the fixed proportion of admissions of Indians should be one-third of the number of vacancies. Several witnesses suggested a fixed proportion. Thus Sir R. N. Mukerji, a Calcutta merchant, proposed one-fourth; Mr. H. L. Stephenson, Financial Secretary to the Bengal Government, one-sixth; Mr. J. N. Gupta, a Bengali civilian, one-fourth; Mr. Sabnis, the Dewan of Kolhapur State, one-fourth; and Sir Narayen Chandavarkar, a Bombay judge, one-third. I may note that the real answer to all these propositions was made by Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, the editor of the *Bengalee*, who objected to the fixing of a minimum proportion of Europeans in the higher posts, on the ground that to reserve any proportion of

appointments on the basis of race would be contrary to the Queen's Proclamation and to the accepted policy of the Government. If that objection is valid as against prescribing a minimum of Europeans, it is equally valid against reserving a proportion for Indians.

Mr. W. D. Braithwaite, the President of the European Defence Association, made an important objection. He disapproved of simultaneous examinations because they "would inevitably lead to attempts on the part of political agitators to exercise an undesirable influence upon young Indian candidates at the most impressionable period of their lives." That is a new class of argument, and it may be observed that such attempts are by no means unknown among Indian students in England. Mr. Bhupendra Nath Basu, a prominent Bengali politician, told the Commission that he hoped it would not mean "hopes deferred." If they could not give simultaneous examinations, "give us, in any way you can, the separation of judicial and executive functions." His demand was singular, but the whole question of the agitation for separating judicial and executive functions must be reserved for discussion upon another occasion. Mr. W. J. Reid, Chief Secretary to the Assam Government, was against simultaneous examinations, but if a change must be made he should, as regarded Assam, advocate a system of combined nomination and examination. Mr. R. B. Ewbank, a Bombay civilian, advocated "recruitment of Indians by separate examination in India, with provision that a certain number of posts should be reserved for Englishmen." Mr. B. C. Allen, a Bengal Deputy Commissioner, also favoured a separate examination, but held that there should be selection as well, and that Indians should be recruited in India.

Mr. R. P. Paranjpe, the distinguished scholar who is Principal of the Fergusson College at Poona, objected to the present system on pecuniary grounds, and thought that "the examinations in India and England should be precisely the same, with the same examiners, the *viva voce* work to be undertaken by the same examiners, who should go out to India for the purpose." Mr. Paranjpe does not appear to have realised that owing to the difference of date his proposal would be utterly fatal to secrecy, and that its complex character might well, in view of his own special experience and authority, be cited as an argument against simul-

taneous examinations. The Aga Khan, who spoke for Mohammedans, favoured simultaneous examinations not only for the "Covenanted" Service, but for the Medical, Forest, and Police Departments as well. His views are of importance because in 1887 the Mohammedans were in the main opposed to simultaneous examinations, on the ground that their community being backward in education, the change might mean a large influx of Hindus into the service, which they would resent. Sir Pherozeshah Mehta said that "if simultaneous examinations were instituted, for twenty-five years the English element would continue to predominate." Here, again, the admission is really, from the British point of view, a complete condemnation of the proposal, for it is essential to the stability and character of British rule that the British element should not cease to predominate in twenty-five years, or at any given period. Finally, it may be mentioned that Mr. W. H. Sharp, Director of Public Instruction in the Bombay Presidency, declared that "simultaneous examinations would dominate the whole educational system in India, and nothing else would have any chance by the side of it. . . . Almost every undergraduate in India would try his luck, and would demand that the University courses should be so framed as to give him a chance. . . . He was confident that the Government would have to yield to the clamour and change the courses."

The Public Services Commission is to return to India next winter to take evidence regarding the provincial and special services. Its recommendations regarding simultaneous examinations cannot be known for another eighteen months, perhaps not for two years. The points and arguments which have been here collated may meanwhile assist in the formation of opinion upon a question which is of vital importance to the future of British rule in India. We depend for our success upon the justice and enlightenment of our rule, and we can only continue to preserve its essentially British character so long as Britons continue to predominate in the Civil Service. That, in brief, is the final answer to the demand now advanced. British rule in India will only remain British while it is chiefly exercised by Britons. If we wish to hold India our first duty, as the late Duke of Argyll wrote long ago, is to guard our own rule. Simultaneous examinations would soon go far to undermine it.

ASIATICUS.